Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/ottoludwigszwisc0000will

OTTO LUDWIG'S

ZWISCHEN HIMMEL UND ERDE

SSGS

STANFORD STUDIES IN GERMANICS AND SLAVICS

Edited by

EDGAR LOHNER, C. H. VAN SCHOONEVELD,
F. W. STROTHMANN

VOLUME III

1967
MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE · PARIS

OTTO LUDWIG'S
ZWISCHEN HIMMEL UND ERDE

A STUDY OF ITS ARTISTIC STRUCTURE

by

WILLIAM J. LILLYMAN
Stanford University

1967
MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE · PARIS

© 1967 by Mouton & Co., Publishers, The Hague, The Netherlands.

No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.

PT2426
.Z4L5

Printed in the Netherlands by Mouton & Co., Printers, The Hague.

For
Edgar Lohner

04625

Und doch kann man nur dann sagen, dass man ein Werk, einen Geist verstehe, wenn man den Gang und Gliederbau nachkonstruieren kann. Dieses gründliche Verstehen nun, welches, wenn es in bestimmten Worten ausgedrückt wird, Charakterisieren heisst, ist das eigentliche Geschäft und innere Wesen der Kritik.

Friedrich Schlegel

PREFACE

The writing of this study has been made possible by the generous encouragement and criticism given me by Dr. Kurt Hommel, Professor Ingrid Strohschneider-Kohrs, and Professor Edgar Lohner. It is especially to Professor Lohner, whose intellectual vigor and uncompromising enthusiasm for literature provided my best source of inspiration, that this work owes any merit it may possess.

I should also like to express my gratitude to Professors F. W. Strothmann, K. Müller-Vollmer, and L. Weinstein for reading and criticizing this study as it progressed toward its final form.

A portion of chapter V has appeared previously in the *Monatshefte,* Wisconsin. The editor has kindly given permission to reprint this material here.

Stanford University, Calif.
May 1965

WILLIAM J. LILLYMAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 9

Introduction 13

I. Otto Ludwig's Theory of the Novel, the Origins of his Theory and its Relation to his Practice as a Novelist in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* 17

II. The Motifs of Misunderstanding and Isolation: Previous Critical Discussions 34

III. The Misunderstanding of Reality 40

IV. The Main Cause of the Misunderstanding of Reality . . 52

V. The Motif of Isolation and the Artistic Devices employed to express it 55
  1. Herr Nettenmair 57
  2. Fritz Nettenmair 64
  3. Apollonius Nettenmair 81

VI. The Significance of the Title 100

VII. The Motif of Isolation in the Literature of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries 125

VIII. Otto Ludwig's Method of Narration 146

Appendix A: A Synopsis of the Plot of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* 161

Appendix B: The Problem of a Correct Text 164

Table of Section Divisions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* . . 184

Bibliography 186

INTRODUCTION

It is the main aim of this study to present a detailed analysis of the artistic structure of Otto Ludwig's *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, to show the function and significance of its motifs, leitmotifs, symbols, images, and method of narration. There have been critical studies, essays, and dissertations which have treated one or more or, indeed, almost all of these features of the novel. The present interpretation, however, arose from the conviction that all of the previous analyses had, in many essential points, failed to grasp the novel's structure, that the artistic function and significance of important elements had not been clearly shown, had not been seen in relation to the novel as a whole.

Ludwig's writings in general, and *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in particular, have constantly been compared to other works of nineteenth century German Realism. The present study, however, wishes to approach the question of the historical significance of Ludwig's novel from a broader perspective. It will attempt to discover whether any European or American writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries chose, for example, the same motifs, symbols, and images which Ludwig employed in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and whether they had the same function and significance in these other writers' works. An attempt is thus made to place Ludwig's novel in a European and American tradition which extends throughout Post-Romantic literature up to the middle of the twentieth century.

There are two prerequisites of any such detailed interpretation as the present one if it is to prove fruitful. The first of these is the establishment, as far as possible, of a correct text of the work to be analyzed.

The investigation of this matter was especially rewarding since it was discovered that the editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* which the foremost critics of the novel used did not present the novel as Ludwig had written it. The editors of these editions took extensive liberties with the original text which they, moreover, nowhere acknowledged.[1] The consequences of this for the understanding of Ludwig's novel will be pointed out here.

The second prerequisite is a consideration and discussion of the previously published critical writings on *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.* This will be undertaken throughout the main analysis and in the footnotes. I shall attempt to show that several of the critics who have concerned themselves with the novel have ignored, to a surprising degree, the opinions of previous critics, that there has indeed been, on occasion, little "co-ordination" in the criticism of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. Thus, certain valid insights of earlier critics have been overlooked or forgotten by later ones. On the other hand, certain (in my opinion) incorrect interpretations have been accepted and repeated constantly by recent critics.

A survey of the criticism of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* quickly establishes the fact that, apart from essays and remarks by Heinrich Lohre, Hermann J. Weigand, and Fritz Martini,[2] the field is entirely dominated by the analysis of the narrative technique of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* contained in Richard Brinkmann's *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*.[3] Despite all the criticism which has been made of this book,[4] it still remains a perceptive study which makes an essential contribution to the understanding of Ludwig's novel. The present analysis differs from Brinkmann's in that it attempts to give an interpretation of the novel as a whole, whereas Brinkmann concentrates on a detailed examination of narrative points of view and does not treat such problems as the overall structure of the novel, the function of the leitmotifs, dreams, visions, etc., at all and others, the main theme, the significance of the title and of the end of the novel etc., only briefly. Although I disagree with Brinkmann's findings on several major points (e.g., his acceptance of Lutz Besch's analysis of the structure;[5] the significance of the title, the end, and of Apollonius' decision, etc.), this study, like any other future study of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, is indebted to his sensitive and provocative work.

---

[1] See Appendix B, "The Problem of a Correct Text", in the present study.

[2] Heinrich Lohre, "Otto Ludwigs Romanstudien und seine Erzählungspraxis", *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht der zehnten Realschule zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1913). Heinrich Lohre, "Otto Ludwig und Charles Dickens", *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXXIV (1910), 15-45. Hermann J. Weigand, "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXVIII (1946), 385-402. Fritz Martini, *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898* (Stuttgart, 1962).

[3] Richard Brinkmann, *Wirklichkeit und Illusion. Studien über Gehalt und Grenzen des Begriffs Realismus für die erzählende Dichtung des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1957).

[4] Gerhard Kaiser, "Um eine Neubegründung des Realismusbegriffs", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 77 (1958), 161-176. Franz Koch, "Zur Kunst der Interpretation. Anlässlich von Richard Brinkmanns *Wirklichkeit und Illu-*

It also seems advisable to settle here, at the very beginning, certain problems of terminology which arise. There are two directly opposed uses of the terms "subjective" and "objective" in regard to narrative technique in the novel. Some critics (e.g., Richard Brinkmann,[6] Erich Auerbach,[7] and Leon Edel[8]) speak of a novel as "objective" when the omniscient narrator is present and as "subjective" when only the voices of the characters are heard, when the narration is from their points of view. Other critics, such as Alexander Hohlfeld[9] and Austin Warren[10] employ the terms with the reverse significance, the essential of the "objective" novel being, according to Warren, "the voluntary absence from the novel of the 'omniscient novelist' ".[11] In the present study, the two terms are used in the sense with which Brinkmann, Auerbach, and Edel employ them.

Some critics of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* speak of it as a novel

---

sion", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 77 (1958), 407-422. Renate Heuer, [Review] *Euphorion*, 53 (1959), 467-474. Fritz Martini, *Forschungsbericht zur deutschen Literatur in der Zeit des Realismus* (Stuttgart, 1962), 5-12.

[5] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, p. 169. Lutz Besch, "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *GRM*, XXXI (1943), 19-30.

[6] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 145ff.

[7] *Mimesis* (Bern, 1959), 498.

[8] *The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950* (London, 1955), ix, 129, 136, etc.

[9] "The Life of Otto Ludwig", in: *The German Classics of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Kuno Francke (New York, 1914), IX, 268-279.

[10] Austin Warren and René Wellek, *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1956).

[11] *Ibid.*, 213.

(e.g., Paul Merker,[12] Oskar Walzel [13]), others as a *Novelle* (e.g., Fritz Martini,[14] Lutz Besch [15]). Ludwig himself chose the middle path in the three editions he prepared and called his work an "Erzählung".[16] However, in a most important letter to Berthold Auerbach where he discusses the nature of "die erzählende Gattung" and, obviously, of his own "Erzählungen", Ludwig establishes the same criteria for the "Erzählung" as he does for the novel.[17] Also (in the absence of absolutely indisputable distinctions between novel and *Novelle*) the length of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, its intense psychological analysis of several characters, its narrative method which anticipates features of the so-called modern psychological novel,[18] the impossibility of fitting it into any of the traditional theories of the *Novelle*, etc., all justify viewing *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in relation to the development of the novel in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

---

[12] *Otto Ludwig. Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Paul Merker (Munich and Leipzig, 1914), III, viiff.

[13] *Die deutsche Literatur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1929), 37.

[14] *Forschungsbericht zur deutschen Literatur in der Zeit des Realismus*, 9ff.

[15] "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*".

[16] See the bibliography of the present study.

[17] *Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Adolf Stern (Leipzig, 1891), VI, 447-448. Cf. also chapter I of the present study.

[18] Cf. Brinkmann's *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, and chapter VIII of the present study.

CHAPTER I

OTTO LUDWIG'S THEORY OF THE NOVEL, THE ORIGINS OF HIS THEORY AND ITS RELATION TO HIS PRACTICE AS A NOVELIST IN *ZWISCHEN HIMMEL UND ERDE*

I

The central concern of Otto Ludwig's studies of the drama and the novel is to compare these two literary genres with each other and to find a distinction between them. The basic difference at which Ludwig arrives is that the drama has to do with the presentation of man's inner world, with a psychological portrayal, and the novel with the description of the external world, with the historical, with conventions and manners. Generalizing on the drama as a literary form after a discussion of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, Ludwig writes:

> Die Hauptszene [of drama] bleibt des Menschen Inneres; die eigentliche Peripetie und das Leiden, Schuld und Strafe und ihr Zusammenhang, also das Schicksal muss in diesem Innern vorgehen; die äussere Peripetie darf nur eine natürliche Folge der innern sein und durchaus nicht als die Hauptsache erscheinen. Das Historische darf bloss den Hintergrund darstellen.[1]

Ludwig comments on the nature of the novel towards the end of an analysis of Scott's *The Antiquary*:

> Vollends darf das Schicksal des Helden uns nie zu anhaltend pathologisch beschäftigen. Auch das hat Scott vortrefflich verstanden und ist auch diesem Mangel dadurch ausgewichen, dass das Pathologische sich hauptsächlich auf die Figuren beschränkt, mit denen wir nur durch Vermittlung des Helden zu thun haben, mit denen wir nicht Schritt vor Schritt gehen, denen wir nur in Spatien begegnen. Schon aus der relativen

---

[1] *Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften,* ed. Adolf Stern (Leipzig, 1891), V, 214. This edition will be referred to hereafter as Stern.

> Länge des Romans ist die Regel herzuleiten; denn, was wir drei Stunden lang [i.e., in a drama] ertragen, dulden wir nicht die Tage lang, die die Lektüre des Romans ausfüllt. Die Regel bleibt, dass die Grundfabel des Romans nicht tragisch sein darf, auch kein spannendes psychologisch-pathologisches Problem.[2]

Heinrich Lohre,[3] whose opinion we share in regard to the basic distinction between the drama and the novel[4] in Ludwig's theory, draws attention to a further significant formulation: "Ludwigs Meinung geht, kurz zusammengefasst, dahin, in der epischen Gattung müsse die äussere Welt, Zeit, Sitte und Konvention, Gewohnheit, die zähe Macht des Alltags ein Übergewicht haben über die Einzelseele; . . . 'Gegenstand des Romans ist der Mensch unter der historischen Mächte Einfluss, dagegen des Dramas, besonders der Tragödie, der Mensch an sich. So ist aller Roman im Grunde historisch, alles Drama, wenigstens Tragödie, anthropologisch. Dort sind die historischen Agentien, hier die psychologischen die Kämpfer'."[5] Finally, in a most important letter to Berthold Auerbach, which will be referred to in detail in this chapter, Ludwig writes that the novel is mainly concerned with "Gehaben der Stände, ihrer Sprache, Gewohnheit, Sitten, Moden", i.e., with the external world, and the drama with "die psychologische Entwickelung der Charaktere", i.e., with the inner world of man.[6]

How did Ludwig, however, arrive at his theory? Was it on account of the influence of contemporary aesthetics, of the practice of other dramatists and novelists, or of his own artistic practice?

Three critics, Heinrich Lohre,[7] Albert Meyer,[8] and Fritz Martini,[9] have attempted to show by comparison that Ludwig's theory of the novel was in the main shared by his contemporaries and predecessors.

---

[2] Stern, VI, 129.

[3] "Otto Ludwigs Romanstudien und seine Erzählungspraxis", *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht der zehnten Realschule zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1913).

[4] Lohre writes "episch" (p. 14), but most of his quotations from Ludwig's aesthetic writings are concerned with "Roman", as our excerpts from Lohre's essay will show. Ludwig, however, makes no distinction between epic and novel on the points which Lohre discusses, cf. Lohre's list of quotations (p. 14ff.) and Ludwig's remarks in which he treats "Epos" and "Roman" as identical (Stern, VI, 104-105). The point, however, becomes important later when Lohre compares Hegel's statements about "Epos" with Ludwig's about "Roman" and fails to notice, as Fritz Martini points out, that Hegel makes an important distinction between epic and novel. We shall discuss this in detail.

[5] Lohre, 14.

[6] Stern, VI, 448.

[7] In the essay cited in note 3 above.

Lohre places several of Hegel's formulations from his *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* beside Ludwig's to demonstrate the similarity of their ideas. Both Hegel and Ludwig emphasize that the drama presents "Handlung", whereas the epic and (in Ludwig's view) the novel is concerned with "Begebenheiten".[10] This is further linked with the opinion of both writers that the dramatic hero must be active, the epic hero (Hegel) or the hero of the novel (Ludwig) passive. "Hegel . . .: 'Der dramatische Charakter macht sich durch die Art seines Zweckes, den er unter den gegebenen ungewussten Umständen kollisionsvoll durchsetzen will, sein Schicksal selbst, dem epischen im Gegenteil wird es gemacht.' . . . Ludwig: 'Der Dramenheld macht seine Geschichte, der Romanheld erlebt die seine, ja man kann sagen: den Romanhelden macht seine Geschichte'." [11] Similarly, Albert Meyer attempts to draw a parallel between Ludwig's theory of the novel and the drama and that expounded by Goethe in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*: "Ludwig trifft im ganzen die gleiche Unterscheidung zwischen Roman und Drama, wie sie Goethe in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, 5. Buch, 7. Kap. angibt: 'Im Roman sollen vorzüglich Gesinnungen und Begebenheiten vorgestellt werden; im Drama Charaktere und Taten.' Die anschliessenden Betrachtungen im *Meister* über die Passivität des Romanhelden, den Zufall usf. stimmen mit den Aussagen Ludwigs durchaus überein." [12] Although there is in the contrast between "Begebenheiten" and "Handlung" or "Taten" in the theories of Goethe, Hegel and Ludwig the same conception of the hero of drama as active

---

[8] Albert Meyer, *Die Ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs* (Winterthur, 1957).

[9] Fritz Martini, *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus* (Stuttgart, 1962).

[10] Lohre's quotation (p. 16) is taken from the 1838 edition of Hegel's works, and he gives the reference as (3, 363). The exact Hegel reference of Lohre would be: *G. W. F. Hegels Werke*, X (Dritte Abteilung) *Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik*, ed. by D. H. G. Hotho (Berlin, 1938), 363-364. The Ludwig passage is Stern, VI, 112, for epic, and Stern, VI, 105, for novel (Lohre, 17).

[11] Lohre, 17. The Ludwig quotation is: Stern, VI, 145.

[12] Meyer, 151, note 27.

and the hero of an epic (Hegel) or novel (Goethe and Ludwig) as passive, there is, however, by no means Ludwig's major distinction between the drama as dealing with the psychological development of character, with the inner world, and the novel as being concerned with the historical, with "Gehaben der Stände, ihrer Sprache, Gewohnheit, Sitten, Moden", with the external world.

In regard to Hegel's aesthetics, Fritz Martini, in his more differentiated analysis, draws attention to a fact which Lohre failed to see, namely that Hegel makes a distinction between epic and novel which Ludwig does not. Lohre's quotations from Hegel's works all have to do with the epic and he places these beside statements of Ludwig which are concerned with the novel, as the last example quoted above from Lohre's essay reveals.[13] Summing up the distinction between Hegel's definiton of the epic and the novel, Martini writes: "Der Weg des Romans führt nach innen; dort stellt sich im Gegensatz zu der versachlichten Wirklichkeit der Gesellschaft das Seelenhafte wieder her. Dies bedeutet auch, dass der Roman nicht mehr primär Begebenheiten . . . wie das Epos erzählt, sondern innerseelische Vorgänge, Zustände und Entfaltungen." [14] The distinction which Hegel makes between epic and novel is, then, the same as that which Ludwig makes between novel and drama, but both writers' theories of the novel are diametrically opposed. It is not the novel which emphasizes the inner world of man in Ludwig's view, but the drama. As he said of the latter: "Die Hauptszene bleibt des Menschen Inneres." [15]

Martini also draws attention to Schopenhauer's and F. Th. Vischer's statements concerning the novel as a literary form. According to Schopenhauer: "Ein Roman wird desto höherer und edlerer Art seyn, je mehr inneres und je weniger äusseres Leben er darstellt; . . . Die Kunst besteht darin, dass man mit dem möglichst geringsten Aufwand von äusserem Leben das innere in die stärkste Bewegung bringe; denn das innere ist eigentlich der Gegenstand unseres Interesses." [16] Vischer expresses his view as follows: "Der Roman sucht die poetische Lebendigkeit da, wohin sie sich bei wachsender Vertrocknung des Öffentlichen geflüchtet hat: im engeren Kreise, der Familie, dem Privatleben, in der Individualität, im Innern." [17] Next, Martini considers Ludwig's writings on the novel [18] and, without giving any supporting evidence, begins his summary of Ludwig's theory of the novel: "Roman – dies hiess mikroskopisch psychologische Analyse. . . ." [19] Martini appears here to be attempting to reveal the same theoretical point of view in the aesthetics of Hegel, Schopenhauer, Vischer, and Ludwig, but all the previous quotations we have made from Ludwig's writings contradict Martini's description of his theory. Nevertheless, although Martini does not support his statement by quotations and although our evidence till now denies his view, this does not mean that it is completely without support. Ludwig's "Studien" were written down unsystematically over a period of years [20] in the form of a diary [21] and the first editor of the "Shakespeare-Studien", Moritz Heydrich, perceived that these contained "manches . . . Verworrne".[22] Heinrich Lohre also noticed what he referred to as mollifications [23] in Ludwig's theory that the drama has mainly to do with the psychological investigation of character, with the inner world of man, and the novel mainly with the historical, with conventions and manners, with the external world. The whole problem is one of emphasis, but an emphasis which appears on occasion to be in danger of disappearing completely. Lohre, however, does not quote the most important passages where Ludwig deviates from his basic distinction. On several occasions, Ludwig talks of a psychological novel[24] and also writes: "Im Romane ist breiter Raum für die Darstellung und Ausmalung der dunkeln Vorstellungen, die Denken und Sprechen begleiten und wechselwirkend leiten. Im Romane kann die ganze psychologische Wahrheit dieser Vorgänge sich austoben."[25] It must, however, be taken into consideration that these references to a psychological novel and to psychological truth are made in regard to Dickens' novels and that Ludwig considered the English writer's works to be especially close to the drama in their nature. "Seine [Dickens] Darstellung ist durchaus dramatisch, ja theatralisch, jedes Kapitel eine Szene eines Dramas; . . ."[26] "Der Bau seiner Romane hat Ähnlichkeit mit Dramen. Seine Romane sind erzählte Dramen mit Zwischenmusik, d.i. erzählter."[27] The following general formulation is, however, not concerned with Dickens: "Dort [in drama], besonders in der Tragödie, ist der eigentliche Schauplatz das Gewissen, das Innre des Menschen, hier [in the epic or novel] die ganze äussre und innre Welt."[28] Ludwig is still insisting that the domain of the drama is man's inner world, but extends this in its entirety also to the novel and his major distinction between the two genres is no longer clearly emphasized here.

---

[13] Cf. Lohre, 16-17, for further examples.

[14] The words omitted from Martini's summary are "und Handlungen", for their inclusion here confuses the issue and they do not reflect Hegel's opinion. Hegel maintained that "Das Epos nicht eine Handlung als Handlung, sondern eine Begebenheit zu schildern hat" (Lohre, 16). Cf. also note 10 above for further reference.

[15] Stern, V, 214.

---

[16] The passage appears in Martini's book (p. 392). The only reference he gives in his note is: Arthur Schopenhauer, *Parerga und Paralipomena*, II. Teil (Martini, 878, note 107).

[17] The passage is taken from Martini's book (p. 394). His reference is: F. Th. Vischer, *Ästhetik*, VI, 178 (Martini, 878, note 121).

[18] Martini, 396-400. Despite the objections we have made and will make hereafter to certain statements in Martini's and Brinkmann's books, these two studies are undoubtedly the best discussions of the period of Realism and contain important insights into Ludwig's works.

[19] Martini, 397.

[20] Stern, V, 5-8, 19-21.

[21] Stern, V, 23; VI, 325.

[22] Stern, V, 22.

[23] Lohre, 15, "Erweichungen".

There is, thus, some justification for Martini's statement, although not for the extremeness of its formulation of "mikroskopisch psychologische Analyse . . .".[29] Martini, however, fails to point out that he is basing his definition on an inconsistency in Ludwig's theory. Lohre perceives this inconsistency, even if only to a small degree,[30] but Albert Meyer sees the problem quite acutely when he contrasts two contradictory statements of Ludwig.

> Die Theorie Ludwigs schwankt denn auch in diesem Sinn zwischen blosser Beschreibung, die eine mögliche Romanform einfach feststellt, und dogmatischer Gesetzgebung, die aus Gattungsbedingungen allgemeine Regeln aufstellt. So sagt er einmal über *Harte Zeiten* von Dickens: "Die meisten" (Figuren) "haben eigentlich kein Innres, sie sind poetische

---

[24] Stern, VI, 185-186.

[25] Stern, VI, 73-74.

[26] Stern, VI, 66.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] Stern, VI, 100.

[29] Martini, 397.

[30] Lohre, 15.

Automaten, die eine gewisse Anzahl von Begebenheiten nach dem Uhrwerke abspielen" und meint darin einen wesentlichen Zug des epischen Charakters zu erkennen; ein andermal heisst es: "Im Roman ist breiter Raum für die Darstellung und Ausmalung dunkler Vorstellungen, die Denken und Sprechen begleiten und wechselwirkend leiten. Im Romane kann die ganze psychologische Wahrheit dieser Vorgänge sich austoben."[31]

Meyer believes that this contradiction can be solved by ascribing two parallel theories of the novel to Ludwig. "Der Widerspruch lässt sich offenbar nur so lösen, dass man beide Typen als Gegenstände möglicher Darstellung annimmt: den, der ein Inneres, das heisst eher dramatische Qualität besitzt, und den, der dies nicht hat und sich insofern episch auszeichnet."[32] However, all that Meyer is doing here is confirming what we, with Lohre, regard as Ludwig's basic, but at times not always clear, standpoint, namely that the emphasis on the inner world of man, on psychological development of character is, as Ludwig himself wrote to Auerbach, "ein eigentlich dramatisches Element",[33] for as soon as this appears in the novel Meyer wishes to refer to it as a novel with dramatic quality.[34]

The sharpness of the distinction between drama and novel which Ludwig mostly makes is blunted by examples such as those given above, but it is still doubtful whether Ludwig's theory can be connected so closely with those of Hegel, Schopenhauer and Vischer as Martini does. An especially notable contrast between Ludwig's and Schopenhauer's views is revealed by the fact that the latter regarded the novels of Sir Walter Scott as providing evidence for his theory that the novel has more to do with "inner life". Schopenhauer comments: "Selbst die Romane Walter Scotts haben noch ein bedeutendes Übergewicht des innern über das äussere Leben."[35] As we have shown before, however, Ludwig stated towards the end of a discussion of Scott's *The Antiquary* that psychological and pathological description in a novel should be limited to the minor characters and arrived at the rule, induced by his reading of Scott's novel, that the main plot of a novel should not be concerned with a psychological, pathological problem.[36] It is obvious from these statements and the formulation of this rule that Ludwig did not see, as Schopenhauer did, a significant preponderance of inner life over external life in Scott's novels.

---

[31] Meyer, 166. The two quotations from Ludwig are: Stern, VI, 69; VI, 73-74.

[32] Meyer, 166.

[33] Stern, VI, 448.

[34] Meyer, 166.

[35] Martini, 392. The quotation is taken from the passage already referred to in note 16 above.

The difference between Ludwig's and Vischer's viewpoint is also revealed by their conception of the place which historical factors should assume in the novel. Summarizing Vischer's opinion, Martini writes: "Er [der Roman] zeigt weiter historisches Leben, wobei die Schicksale von Völkern und Kulturen ihn dem Epos anzunähern scheinen, aber das Geschichtliche nur der Hintergrund des persönlichen Lebensschicksals des Helden bleiben darf, soll es nicht ohne einen thematischen und perspektivischen Beziehungspunkt zum nur historischen Sitten- und Genrebild führen. In beiden Fällen dachte Vischer an die vom englischen Roman gebotenen Vorbilder." [37] Ludwig, however, has a quite different opinion. It is in the drama that he relegates the historical to the background: "Die Hauptszene [of drama] bleibt des Menschen Inneres; . . . Das Historische darf bloss den Hintergrund darstellen." [38] He also considers the place of history in the novel, giving it the foremost importance here. "Der Gegenstand des Romanes, der Mensch unter dieser historischen Mächte Einfluss, dagegen des Dramas, besonders der Tragödie, der Mensch an sich. So ist aller Roman im Grunde historisch, alles Drama – wenigstens Tragödie – anthropologisch. Dort sind die historischen Agentien, hier die psychologischen die Kämpfer." [39] Ludwig together with Vischer, as Martini comments,[40] did emphasize the importance of the English novel, but Ludwig's formulations, made under its influence, reveal that he arrived at a completely opposite view to Vischer's. Further evidence that Ludwig regarded the predominant feature of the English novel as the portrayal of historical factors, and of the external world, is his following contrast of Shakespeare and Scott: "Ein Hauptunterschied aber ist, dass Shakespeare ethisch-psychologische und Scott historische Probleme behandelt." [41]

---

[36] Stern, VI, 129.

[37] Martini, 395.

[38] Stern, V, 214.

[39] Stern, VI, 74.

[40] Martini, 396.

It is, then, not to his German predecessors and contemporaries, but to the influence of the artistic works of Shakespeare, Dickens, and Scott on Ludwig that we must look for the origins of his theory of the drama and the novel. It seems almost impossible to overestimate the impression of Shakespeare's works on Ludwig. Not only did he write studies of fourteen of the great English dramatist's plays,[42] he also considered Shakespeare as representing the pinnacle of artistic attainment in the drama, contrasting even Schiller, [43] as is well known, Goethe [44] and Molière unfavorably with him. Typical is the following blunt beginning of the comparison with Molière: "Molière und seine Nachfolger haben einen Charakter zum Zentrum ihrer Stücke gemacht: dasselbe that Shakespeare, nur dass er dem Charakter auch eine Persönlichkeit gab, was Molière zu seinem Nachteile nicht that." [45] Scott and Dickens were studied intensively by Ludwig. Dickens was his favorite novelist and he wrote detailed comments on the following novels: *Hard Times, Barnaby Rudge, A Tale of Two Cities,* and *Great Expectations*.[46]

It is also an easy matter to show by quotation the direct connection between Ludwig's theory of the drama and the novel and the influence the English writers had on him, for it is during his studies of their works, and induced by his view of them, that Ludwig formulates his general theory. As we have pointed out before, Ludwig's statement that the drama is mainly concerned with the inner world of man and his relegation of historical factors to the background occur towards the end of a discussion of *King Lear* and it is during the studies of Scott's works that Ludwig maintains the novel has primarily to do with the historical and with the external world of man in contrast to the drama which is concerned with a psychological portrayal.

---

[41] Stern, VI, 113-114.

[42] Stern, V, 189-252.

[43] Cf. the essays and books of Fr. Keim, H. Kühnlein, A. von Berger, J. Hess, C. Alt, M. Krell, Léon Mis, N. Sevenig, etc., as given in the Otto Ludwig bibliography of H. Göpfert, *Otto-Ludwig-Kalender* (1931), 92-107. Waltraut Leuschner-Meschke also records material concerning this problem in her essay "Aus Otto Ludwigs Kunstauffassung", *Worte und Werte. Bruno Markwardt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1961), 201, note 7.

[44] Stern, V, 63, where Ludwig considers *Götz von Berlichingen* to have no resemblance to Shakespeare's method (contrary to what he regards as the general opinion) and that it is therefore not truly dramatic.

[45] Stern, V, 61.

[46] Stern, VI, 69-74, 132-170.

II

What bearing does Ludwig's basic theory of the novel as dealing with the external world of man, with the historical, conventions and manners, have on his practice as a novelist in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde?* Is Ernst Rose, for example, right when he states that *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* gives us "an unexcelled picture of the life of a German craftsman in the nineteenth century"? [47] According to Ludwig's theory of the novel, this is what it should do. However, we believe that Rose's statement is not correct and will show later in the analysis of the significance of the title that Ludwig employed the slater's trade symbolically to say something about man in general and that he was not concerned with a historical, realistic portrayal as Rose claims. Heinrich Lohre also supplies an argument against Rose's view when he asks: "Wo zeigte sich denn etwa in dieser Erzählung [*Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] das Historische, das Äussere in selbstherrlicher Wichtigkeit? Wo träte es umgestaltend an die Helden heran? Wo griffe es entscheidend in den Kausalnexus ein? Wird Fritz Nettenmair etwa schuldig, weil er ein Thüringischer Kleinstädter und ein Schieferdecker ist? Nein, alle Kräfte, die hier die Handlung vorwärts treiben, entspringen durchaus in der Einzelseele." [48] To take the point to the absurd, one could ask whether Fritz becomes insane because he is a nineteenth century German slater and whether the answer to the problem as to why Apollonius does not marry Christiane after Fritz's death is also to be found in this historical and realistic factor.[49]

In his generalizations about the nature of the novel during the discussions of Scott's *The Antiquary* quoted above, Ludwig maintains that pathological and psychological problems are not the domain of the novel and that these, if they are included, should not be described step by step and should be shown only in the minor characters.[50] However, is not the portrayal of Fritz in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* an excellent example of the description of a growing pathological condition, of insanity? And does not Ludwig indeed show us this development step by step? The following are only a few passages from the first ten sections of the novel where the narrator emphasizes and comments on Fritz's pathological nature.

---

[47] *A History of German Literature* (New York, 1960), 264.

[48] Lohre, 15.

[49] The answering of these two vital questions will be undertaken at length in the chapter concerning the motif of isolation.

> Aber auch in seiner Frau sah er [Fritz] immer mehr etwas, wie einen natürlichen Bundesgenossen des Bruders gegen ihn. Das sah er lange vorher, ehe er noch den geringsten wirklichen Anlass dazu hatte, und das war der Schatten, den seine Schuld in die Zukunft seiner Phantasie warf. Ihr altes Gesetz wird ihn zwingen, durch die Verkehrtheit seiner Abwehrmittel den Schatten selber zur wirklichen, lebendigen Gestalt zu machen und vergeltend in sein Leben hereinzustellen.[51]

> Er [Fritz] ist dem Gespenste seiner Schuld verfallen, dem Gedanken der Vergeltung, der ihn unwiderstehbar treibt, das zu schaffen, was er verhindern will. Zu tief hat ihn die lange stete Gewohnheit, ihn zu denken, eingegraben.[52]

> Zu tief hat er [Fritz] die Geleise des alten Wahngedankens eingedrückt, um ihn für immer verwischen, zu weit ist er gegangen auf dem gefährlichen Weg, um noch umkehren zu können. Die Klarheit des Blitzes müsste schwinden, und der alte Wahn hüllte die Dinge wieder in seine verstellenden Nebel.[53]

In his remarks in regard to Scott's *The Antiquary*, Ludwig admits psychological and pathological problems into the novel if these are shown only in the minor characters. Apollonius is referred to as "our hero" in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*,[54] but is he really so in the sense with which Ludwig uses the term in the remarks on *The Antiquary*, i.e., is Apollonius really the main character in the novel? Paul

---

[50] Stern, VI, 129.

[51] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Berlin, 1862), 80. Unless otherwise stated, all references to the text of the novel are to this, the third edition. Ludwig's original, sometimes unusual spelling has been retained (e.g. "blos", "Aeltern"). For a detailed discussion of the most important editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* see the appendix, "The Problem of a Correct Text".

[52] *Ibid.*, 116.

[53] *Ibid.*, 167-168.

[54] Pp. 14, 15, 16, 17, etc.

Merker writes that Apollonius is "die Hauptperson des Romans" [55] and Oskar Walzel considers that Apollonius' inner development is the backbone of the "Handlungsdichtung".[56] This may, indeed, appear true at first reading, but a closer examination of the text reveals that from Apollonius' return to his home until Fritz's death, i.e., approximately two-thirds of the work,[57] Ludwig's main concern is to show *Fritz's* pathological development, his approaching insanity, as the last quotations above partly demonstrate. Ludwig's switch in emphasis from Apollonius to Fritz takes place because the latter, being more pathological, is of greater psychological interest. Apollonius is mostly in the foreground only when Fritz is not present, and, as far as the action is concerned, his inner development has little outward expression when compared with Fritz's whose approaching insanity and increasing alienation from those about him lead him to more and more violent deeds which dominate the action of the novel almost exclusively, e.g., Fritz's striking of Christiane which causes Ännchen's death, and his attack on Apollonius on the steeple of St. Georg.[58]

Both of these events have been regarded as the climax of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, the former by Lutz Besch [59] and the latter by Arthur

---

[55] *Otto Ludwig. Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Paul Merker (Munich and Leipzig, 1912-1922), III, xiv. This edition will be referred to hereafter as Merker.

[56] *Die deutsche Literatur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1929), 37.

[57] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 34-248, i.e., 214 of the 306 pages of the Third Edition. In "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXVIII (1946), 385-402, H. J. Weigand admits that only the portrayal of Fritz's development has "wirklichen Anspruch auf Lückenlosigkeit" (p. 387, note 5), but still insists on seeing Apollonius as the central character. His reason for this is Fritz's demise "mitten [!] in der Erzählung (p. 387, note 5). Page 248 is hardly the middle of a 306-page novel.

[58] Lutz Besch agrees on this point and offers some further evidence. "Der Schwerpunkt der Handlungsführung liegt bei Fritz; die von ihm ausgelösten Ereignisse füllen den breiteren Raum. Das 11. Kapitel zeigt dies besonders deutlich. Während nur auf wenigen Seiten über des Apollonius Gedanken berichtet wird, nehmen Gedanken und Untat des Bruders mehr als die Hälfte des Kapitels ein" ("Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *GRM*, XXXI, 1943, 25).

[59] Besch, 22. Besch interprets the structure of the novel to be like a pair of scales with section eleven at the balancing point, and as *"Höhepunkt"* (p. 22). (This resembles partial, later attempts to ascribe to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* the typical structure of a five-act drama as undertaken by Ursula Kerrinnis in "Morphologische Untersuchungen an Otto Ludwigs Erzählung

Kracke.[60] The initiator of both of these actions, however, is Fritz and it is our contention that neither of them can be regarded as the climax of the novel, but merely as illustrations of a psychological development which is taking place within Fritz.[61] The climax of the novel lies elsewhere.

Zwischen Himmel und Erde", diss. Bonn, 1949, pp. 53ff.; and by H. E. Loesing in "Der Aufbau der Novellen Otto Ludwigs", diss. Bonn, 1953, pp. 75ff.) Besch himself perceives the flaw in his argument, although this does not cause him to change his conception of the novel's structure: "Steht man hier vor einer wunderbaren Ausgewogenheit, so befriedigt die Gegenüberstellung der Abschnitte II. [Vorgeschichte und Heimkehr von Apollonius] und VI [Gewitternacht] nicht ganz. Das Gewicht verschiebt sich stark zugunsten des letzten Abschnittes. Zwar vollendet er was im II. begonnen wurde, aber die Schilderung der Gewitternacht ist von einer überwältigenden Stärke und lenkt die Aufmerksamkeit vom Kern der Novelle [Kapitel elf] ab. Auf keinen Fall hält die Darstellung der Vorgeschichte und Heimkehr dem Erwachen von Apollonius Lebensmut die Waage" (p. 24). Brinkmann (p. 169) accepts, without comment, Besch's analysis. – Helmut Griessmann also sees Ännchen's death as the climax of the novel ("Die Raumgestaltung in Friedrich von Hardenbergs *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* und Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", diss. Bonn, 1955, p. 211).

[60] Arthur Kracke, "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* als Otto Ludwigs ureigenstes Werk", *Otto-Ludwig-Kalender* (1942), 26. However, later on Kracke writes that the whole struggle "vollzieht sich . . . im Innern von drei, allenfalls vier Personen, . . ." (p. 31). Kracke contradicts himself by making the struggle of the brothers on the tower, an event which takes place in the external world, the climax of a novel of which he tells us the entire struggle occurs within the characters, and even enforces this by continuing: ". . . die bunte Fülle von Gestalten und Schauplätzen, die breite Behaglichkeit des äusseren Lebens hat keinen Raum" (p. 31). Similarly, Elisabeth Witte regards the struggle on the tower and Fritz's fall as the climax, cf. "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", diss. Göttingen (1958), the graph between pp. 29-30.

[61] In *Between Real and Ideal. The Course of Otto Ludwig's Development as a Narrative Writer* (Chapel Hill, 1963), W. H. McClain correctly maintains: "It is actually not necessary for us to know more than Ludwig tells us about the physical surroundings, for the emphasis in the story is not on events, as we soon see, but on the revelation of character. As the tale proceeds it becomes an even more searching analysis of the three main characters" (p. 60). McClain later considers some of the main motifs of the novel (pp. 64-65), showing that they have to do with the inner worlds of the characters, and gives brief interpretations of Apollonius, Fritz, and their father, but he does not explicitly show that the events of the novel are subordinate to the presentation of the characters' inner worlds, that the events are, indeed, there mainly for their ability to reveal a development in a character's inner world. It is, however, necessary that this be shown in order to refute Besch's and Kracke's statements and to determine where the climax of the novel is actually to be found.

Fritz is continually tormented by the idea that Christiane will commit adultery with Apollonius and that Apollonius is trying to ruin him.[62] To prevent this, he has his wife watched by the "Geselle". When Fritz learns that Apollonius has visited Christiane one night during his absence, he is so convinced that he is correct in his assumption of his wife's infidelity that he does not listen to her explanation concerning Ännchen's illness, but strikes her in his rage and thereby causes his daughter's death.[63] This violent action is intended as an illustration of the extent to which Fritz's *idée fixe* is driving him. It has no other justification in the structure of the novel. In regarding this event as the climax, Besch may have been misled by the narrator's comment, "Des Kindes Tod ist der Gipfel", but the narrator also continues: "Und vielleicht ist er es noch nicht!" [64] Indeed, Fritz's obsession with his *idée fixe* takes on larger dimensions when he later on, in section seventeen, sees himself abandoned by all and lays the blame for this on Apollonius. Evidence is supplied by the following very important passage:

> Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz. Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm Alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wen Er gehen müsste, Er! die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen. Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt, als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein, wie Alles, was einmal mein war! [65]

Shortly after this passage from section seventeen, the narrator comments on Fritz's final insanity: "Er hatte die Grenze überschritten, über welche keine Rückkehr mehr ist." [66] Section seventeen thus presents the climax of Fritz's psychological development, his insanity. Section eleven, Fritz's striking of Christiane, was merely the illustration of an early stage on the way to this insanity and what follows after section seventeen is a description of the consequences of Fritz's insanity, not a further climax or culmination.

---

[62] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 95, 133, etc.

[63] *Ibid.*, 155-158.

[64] *Ibid.*, 164.

[65] *Ibid.*, 239.

[66] *Ibid.*, 240.

One of Ludwig's changes in the section division from the First[67] to the Second Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* also offers evidence for regarding the section describing Fritz's insanity both as the climax of his psychological development and as the climax of the novel. In the First Edition, Ludwig had given Fritz's attack on Apollonius a section of its own,[68] thus emphasizing Fritz's action and making it appear the climax of the novel rather than merely a consequence of the true climax, Fritz's insanity, which was described in the preceding section. In the Second Edition, the portrayal of Fritz's attack on his brother is not given a section of its own. The division has been removed.[69] Thus section eighteen of the Second Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* tells us not only of Fritz's attack, but also of the belief of everyone, except Apollonius, that Fritz's death was an accident, of Fritz's funeral, of the speculations of the townspeople as to whether Apollonius will marry Christiane, of Christiane's own hopes in this regard and of Herr Nettenmair's unsuccessful resumption of control of the family business. This division into sections of the Second Edition emphasizes the psychological development, Fritz's insanity, by giving it a section of its own (the seventeenth) and allowing the major event which results from it, Fritz's attack on Apollonius, to mingle with the several other occurrences, the several other consequences of the psychological development. In other words, the description of an inner development in a character is followed by the portrayal of events in which the character's actions illustrate the result of his inner development, and it is, moreover, this inner development which is the center of interest, the main point of the narrative.[70]

Ludwig's basic theory of the novel, then, appears to be in exact opposition to his practice as exemplified in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.* He was, however, aware of this. On April 14, 1861, he wrote in a letter to Berthold Auerbach who was attempting to persuade him to turn completely from his dramatic efforts to the composition of novels:

---

[67] Frankfurt a. M., 1856.

[68] P. 259.

[69] Compare First Edition, p. 259 with Second Edition (Frankfurt, 1858) 263-264. The Third Edition (p. 248) follows the Second Edition.

[70] The Merker Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, although it claims to base its text on that of the Second Edition and to deviate from this only in matters of spelling and punctuation (III, 307), retains here the section division of the First Edition (Merker, III, 166). For a detailed analysis of Merker's considerable and unacknowledged changes in Ludwig's text, see appendix B, "The Problem of a Correct Text".

> Ebenso, lieber Auerbach, geht mir's mit der erzählenden Form. Je weniger spezifisches Talent dafür ich besitze, desto genauer es damit zu nehmen wäre ich genöthigt, erhielte ich mich nicht halb absichtlich in einem gewissen Leichtsinn in Bezug darauf. Ein weiterer Grund für letzteres ist ein anderer Spross aus derselben Wurzel; meine Isolierung schliesst allen Zufluss von realistischen Motiven ab; ich bin lächerlich fremd in der Welt geworden, und namentlich fehlt mir es überall am Modell des Gehabens der Stände, ihrer Sprache, Gewohnheit, Sitten, Moden. Ich muss mir das alles selbst zubereiten, soweit es möglich ist; das führt mich dahin, ein eigentlich dramatisches Element, die psychologische Entwickelung der Charaktere und zwar psychologischer Typen in die erzählende Gattung einzuschwärzen. Das geht nicht, ohne Verletzung der Kunstform; ich habe also nur die Alternative; entweder die Anforderungen, denen ich nicht genug thun kann, mir absichtlich zu verdunkeln, oder ganz von der Erzählung zu lassen; . . .[71]

Except for the problem of whether the characters Ludwig portrays in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* really are psychological *types* (this will be considered later on), these remarks coincide exactly with our above conclusions in regard to Ludwig's last novel. In this letter, Ludwig explicitly denies that his own novels are concerned with a realistic portrayal, thus contradicting Ernst Rose's characterization of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and W. H. McClain's unsupported remark that "Ludwig himself thought of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* as a realistic work".[72] It was in his formulation of a general theory of the novel as a literary form during a discussion of Dickens' *Great Expectations*, not in regard to his own novels, that Ludwig stated: "Die durchaus realistische Natur des Romans wird mir immer deutlicher."[73] In his letter, Ludwig also explicitly states that the emphasis in his novels is on the psychological development of characters, although he regards this as the domain of the drama and contrary to the artistic form of the novel. Here there is once more the all-pervading in-

[71] Stern, VI, 447-448.

[72] *Between Real and Ideal*, 60-61.

[73] Stern, VI, 149.

fluence of Shakespeare. In Ludwig's eyes, Shakespeare depicted mainly "Des Menschen Inneres",[74] as he noted during a discussion of *King Lear*. Since also Shakespeare was for Ludwig the supreme model of artistic achievement in the drama, he reached the conclusion "die shakespearische ist die eigentliche dramatische Form",[75] and hence could base his theory of the drama on Shakespeare's practice of psychological presentation of character, of emphasis on the inner world of man. The novel was, however, the direct antithesis of the drama in Ludwig's eyes and supported by his view of Scott as being concerned with the historical, not the psychological, he reached the conclusion that the novel should be concerned with realistic motifs, with "Gehaben der Stände, ihrer Sprache, Gewohnheit, Sitten, Moden", with the external world of man.

The extent to which Ludwig contradicted his own theory of the novel in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* by placing the emphasis on the inner world of his characters will become further evident during the discussion of the main motifs, symbols, images, and method of narration of this novel.

---

[74] Stern, V, 214.

[75] Stern, V, 63.

CHAPTER II

THE MOTIFS OF MISUNDERSTANDING AND ISOLATION: PREVIOUS CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS

Two motifs in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* require particular attention because of their dominance in the novel. These are the motifs of misunderstanding and of isolation. Both have been perceived and commented upon briefly by various critics, e.g., Johannes Klein, Richard Brinkmann, Fritz Lockemann, and William H. McClain, but the extent of their importance for the novel and its structure has not been demonstrated, nor has the special kind of isolation prevalent in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* been defined sufficiently.

Johannes Klein considers that the misunderstanding in Ludwig's novel is of such a degree "dass keine Gestalt von der andern wirklich etwas weiss".[1] Similarly, Richard Brinkmann writes: "Wie Apollonius und Fritz so leben auch die anderen Menschen alle in der Erzählung in der Befangenheit, in der oft dumpfen Befangenheit ihrer eigenen Vorstellungen, die sie sich von der Wirklichkeit machen, in denen sie aber doch eigentlich nur sich selbst kennen und nicht die Welt." [2] Both Klein and Brinkmann, in his more differentiated statement, claim that *all* the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* almost always misunderstand each other and the world in which they live. But is this true of *all* the characters? Are there not characters in the novel of whom the reader is told that they do understand the "world" and each other, that, indeed, they are especially introduced into the novel for this purpose, that this is their function in the structure of the novel?

---

[1] Johannes Klein, *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle von Goethe bis zur Gegenwart* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 202.

[2] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 212.

Brinkmann continues his above-quoted statement maintaining: "Wo sie [the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] je in einen echten Kontakt mit der Wirklichkeit kommen, wo sie einen Augenblick vielleicht die wahre Realität erkennen, da ist es in jenen exzeptionellen Situationen, in denen die Wirklichkeit selbst sie kräftig anpackt und ihr Handeln entschieden bestimmt."[3] Brinkmann gives Apollonius' experiences during the fire on the steeple of St. Georg as an example of a situation where a character perceives reality, because it takes hold of him and compels him to act:

> Weder der Verstand noch das vom Verstande verwirrte Gefühl scheinen fähig, die Wirklichkeit zu legitimieren. Das "Schicksal" erst erlöst Apollonius in seiner Entscheidung ab: Bei der Brandkatastrophe findet er zu dem, was er tun soll. Ein starkes Ereignis mit einem eindeutigen Hinweis auf das Gebot, die Not zu wenden, eine Notwendigkeit im eigentlichen Sinne erlöst Apollonius von dem Bann seiner eigenen Gedanken:
>
> "Vor der wirklichen Not und ihren Anforderungen traten die Gebilde seines Brütens wie verschwimmende Schatten zurück. . . . Mit Gedanken kann man Gedanken widerlegen, gegen Gefühle sind sie eine schwache Waffe. Vergebens sah sein Geist den rettenden Weg; er war in der allgemeinen Erschlaffung mit erkrankt. Jetzt war ein stärkeres gesundes Gefühl gegen die starken kranken Gefühle aufgeglüht und hatte sie in seiner Flamme verzehrt. Er wusste, ohne besonders daran zu denken, er hatte den rettenden Entschluss gefunden . . . [from *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*]."[4]

If Apollonius has truly grasped "die wahre Realität" here, as Brinkmann claims, then why does he not marry Christiane at the end, why is he still unable to perceive that there would be no guilt in such a marriage? To what extent, then, can Apollonius be said to grasp reality here? What is the decision that saves him? When does he make this decision? Why and how does it save him? We shall attempt to answer these most important questions in our interpretation and to show that, although Brinkmann perceives the motif of misunderstanding, he only touches on most complex problems in a few generalized remarks, that he thereby fails to recognize the complexity of these problems and that, in regard to them, he misinterprets the novel.

The next question which should be asked, and is asked and answered by the following critics discussed here, is: what causes the misunderstanding in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde?* W. H. McClain writes that the "barriers" created by the misunderstanding become insurmountable and "Fritz's betrayal of Apollonius, Christiane, and his father is, of course, the principal cause of the barrier which separates the main characters of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* from one another".[5] If Fritz's betrayal is the principal cause of the misunderstanding which separates the main characters, then why, as McClain himself also notes, do Apollonius, Christiane, and his father misunderstand each other and why are they still "separated" at the end of the novel when Fritz's betrayal and deception have been exposed? McClain senses that his explanation of the main cause is insufficient, for he continues: "The strange nature of the father and the two brothers makes it seem doubtful, however, whether even under better conditions they could have reached the kind of understanding necessary for close family relationships, for they simply cannot communicate with one another." [6] Just what this "strange nature" is which causes Apollonius, Fritz, and their father to misunderstand each other constantly, remains a problem which must be considered at length. McClain, however, makes an important step in the right direction when he notes that the members of the Nettenmair family cannot communicate with each other. This lack of communication must, however, be defined more precisely.

---

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*

Johannes Klein suggests another cause of the misunderstanding. He writes of the "Isolierung der Charaktere, die so weit geht, dass keine Gestalt von der andern wirklich etwas weiss, ...".[7] Isolation, then, and we agree with this, is the main cause of the misunderstanding. Unfortunately, however, Klein does not proceed to define the isolation prevalent in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.* Is it, for example, Romantic "Einsamkeit", or something else? W. H. McClain speaks of the "loneliness" [8] of the characters and then, more generally in his "Conclusion", he states: "In the case of the main characters both the search for meaning and the search for integration is, moreover, an essentially lonely one, for most of them, as we saw, live in a kind of isolation."[9] Just what "kind of isolation" this is in regard to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is the important question to which only Richard Brinkmann has given a convincing answer. In the first passage quoted from Brinkmann above, he states that, like Fritz and Apollonius, all the characters in Ludwig's novel misunderstand the reality in which they live, because their picture of it shows them "nur sich selbst . . . und nicht die Welt".[10] Although we disagree that this is true of all the characters, it is nevertheless a most important statement for the understanding of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. In order that its full significance may be grasped, however, it must be discussed at much greater length than Brinkmann has done. It becomes, for example, most significant when we know that Brinkmann is here quoting one of the narrator's comments on Fritz. In the novel we read: "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!"[11] It is also important to know that this comment by the narrator is, as we shall show, an ironic variation of one of the leitmotifs used in regard to Fritz throughout the novel. Brinkmann also does not use the term "isolation" for the phenomenon he is describing here. If he had done so, it would have given him a point of comparison for seeing *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in relation to much European literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries where this motif was a dominant one with the particular sense it possesses in Ludwig's novel.

---

[5] *Between Real and Ideal*, 65.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle*, 202.

[8] *Between Real and Ideal*, 65.

William H. McClain also makes an important observation in regard to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* when he remarks on the total absence of concern with the divine: "This brings us to one of the most fascinating things about *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, that in spite of its religious-sounding title, its Christian symbols, and its moral tone, it is a work totally without transcendence in the Christian sense. Although a church is one of the main focal points of the action Ludwig never shows us its interior; and we also note that religious agents are absent and that the sacraments provided by the church are never mentioned. In their moments of anguish, which are many indeed, the characters receive no help from the church, as far as we know, and there is no mention of their ever turning to a higher being for help." [12] In his "Conclusion", McClain observes of Ludwig's characters in general: "One of the strangest things about Ludwig's characters is that they seem to lack so completely the kind of piety which one would expect to find in people of comparable social and cultural backgrounds. None of them, overtly at least, manifests any concern about his relationship to God or to any other kind of divine transcendence." [13] To formulate McClain's perception in a slightly different way: part of the isolation prevalent among the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, as we shall show, may be characterized by saying that they have no contact with the divine, or any other metaphysical sphere.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, 82.

[10] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 212.

[11] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 65.

Finally, a remark which Fritz Lockemann makes concerning the portrayal of the characters in *Die Heiterethei* seems to describe even better certain of the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. Lockemann writes of: "Der . . . freie Einzelmensch, der nicht mehr von einer Gemeinschaft getragen wird, der auch nicht mehr im Religiösen wurzelt, nicht mehr in einer Welt der Kunst oder in der grossen Natur, . . ." [14]

The following questions in regard to the motifs of misunderstanding and isolation in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* remain, then, to be answered, or the answers already given by critics must be supported or denied by a more detailed study of the text: How important are the motifs of misunderstanding and isolation in the novel? What is the exact nature of the misunderstanding? What is its main cause: Fritz's deception or the isolation of the characters? What is the exact nature of the isolation? Are the characters isolated from each other, from nature, from the divine? Which of the characters are isolated? To what extent are they isolated? Is it true, for example, as Fritz Lockemann writes of Apollonius: "Die seelische Entwicklung des Apollonius, die zur Verwirklichung seiner eigenen Ordnung führt, ist ganz individueller Art. Sie isoliert ihn völlig; auch die Nächststehenden, der Vater, die geliebte Frau, verstehen sie nicht, müssen sich ihr einfach fügen."[15] Is Apollonius so completely isolated that no one understands his decision at the end? Are some characters more isolated than others? If the motif is so dominant in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, what poetic means does Ludwig use to express it? Has the motif of isolation any connection, for example, with the symbols and the many leitmotifs employed in the novel? What is its importance for the structure of the work as a whole, for the structure of one of the sections (e.g., section six, which we shall examine)? How is the motif of isolation connected with the other motifs of the work, e.g., those of guilt, honor, and insanity?

---

[12] *Between Real and Ideal*, 63.

[13] *Ibid.*, 81.

[14] Fritz Lockemann, *Gestalt und Wandlungen der deutschen Novelle. Geschichte einer literarischen Gattung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1957), 151.

The present study will attempt to answer these questions and to prove that *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* cannot be properly understood, nor its historical significance grasped, until the motif of isolation, with all the formal means employed by Ludwig to express it, is perceived as the dominant one in the novel, and the novel is then considered from this viewpoint in relation to European and American literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[16]

---

[15] *Ibid.*, 152.

[16] This has never been undertaken in detail before. Most critics fail to state what the central motif of the novel is or they regard it as the motif of guilt (e.g., H. Lohre, "Otto Ludwigs Romanstudien und seine Erzählungspraxis", 13-14), or as the struggle between the two brothers, as a Cain-Abel motif (e.g., L. W. Forest, "Das Leitmotiv in Otto Ludwigs Erzählungen *Die Heiteretei* und *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", M. A. thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, 1951, p. 25; Richard Müller-Ems, *Otto Ludwigs Erzählungskunst*, Berlin, 1905, p. 25; Kracke, 22, 26), or as "das Glück und die Möglichkeiten es zu verfehlen" (Heinrich Loevenich, "Zur Bedeutung des Raumes in Erzählungen", *Der Deutschunterricht*, XV, 1963, p. 105), etc.

CHAPTER III

THE MISUNDERSTANDING OF REALITY

When Ludwig describes the inner world of a character in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, he shows us the interpretation the character forms of the events which happen to and about him, the emotions which these events arouse in him, the interpretation he forms of his own and the other characters' words and actions and, also, his interpretation of the motives, thoughts, and feelings which lead to the other characters' words and actions. In short, the inner world of a character is his attempt to understand the everyday reality in which he lives, and the emotions which this arouses in him.

It must, however, be recognized that, except for brief moments, the main characters misunderstand reality. They misunderstand what is happening to and about them and they misunderstand the other characters. They fail to grasp what is real in any given situation and reality begins to slip away from them.

An examination of section six, a conversation between Fritz and Apollonius, in relation to the rest of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, will show not only the two brothers' misunderstanding of each other, but also their misunderstanding of the other characters.

I

The oppressive atmosphere in the Nettenmair household has become so intolerable to Apollonius that he approaches his brother to ask him the reason for his behavior. When he perceives that Fritz is in a bad humor, he postpones talking with him until the next day, but tells him there is something he wishes to discuss. As section six begins, Fritz is wondering what Apollonius wants of him and fears that he is playing into his hands. At the moment Fritz is on his guard and he therefore calls his brother a hypocrite to whom he, Fritz, must lose because of his honesty. Fritz's opinion of Apollonius varies between a dreamer and a hypocrite according to whether he thinks he has the better of him or not.

Apollonius, who is determined not to be distracted by Fritz's moods, expresses in his first words the hope that their discussion will be of advantage to them and everyone else. It is characteristic of Fritz that he misinterprets these words to find a specific allusion to Christiane. " 'Wenn du mich ruhig und brüderlich anhören willst', sagte Apollonius, 'so hoff' ich, dieser Morgen soll der beste sein für dich und mich und uns Alle.' 'Und uns Alle', wiederholte Fritz, und legte von seiner Erklärung der drei Worte nichts in seinen Ton. 'Ich weiss, dass du immer an uns Alle denkst; darum rede nur jovial vom Herzen weg, ich mach's auch so.' "[1] The word *jovial* is one of the leitmotifs which is used throughout *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in connection with Fritz. It has occurred once before in section six in the description of his greeting of Apollonius. "Fritz bot ihm den unbefangensten, jovialsten guten Morgen, der ihm zu Gebote stand."[2] *Jovial* here suggests that Fritz is anything but jovial, that he is concealing his true feelings behind a mask of cheerfulness in order to be more cunning than his brother. This is apparent later in section six when Apollonius admits he is also to blame for the unpleasant relationship between them, but Fritz, in his thoughts, places all the blame on Apollonius – although he is about to assure him *jovially* of the contrary.[3] This significance which *jovial* has acquired, the mistaken need it expresses to conceal true feelings in order to defend oneself against others, emphasizes Fritz's misunderstanding of the other characters. Elsewhere we read of his opinion of Apollonius: "Die brüderliche Freundlichkeit und Achtung, mit der ihn Apollonius behandelte, war eine Maske, unter der dieser seine schlimmen Pläne sicherer zu bergen meinte; er vergalt ihm, und machte ihn leichter unschädlich, wenn er unter derselben Maske seine Wachsamkeit barg."[4] By disguising his true thoughts and feelings from others, Fritz increases the misunderstanding.

---

[1] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 94.

[2] *Ibid.*, 94.

[3] *Ibid.*, 95.

Apollonius continues the conversation in section six by telling of his belief that the only cause of the dissension between his brother and himself is Christiane's dislike of him. This remark reveals Apollonius' misunderstanding of Christiane's feelings, a necessary misunderstanding since Fritz has deceived them both about each other. It reveals also Apollonius' misunderstanding of the main reason for his brother's attitude. Fritz wishes Apollonius to leave, is continually against him and suspicious of his motives not because Christiane dislikes him but because she loved him and still loves him.

Apollonius' question, in that it shows he is unaware of any other reason for Fritz's inimical attitude, reveals his further misunderstanding of his brother who immediately makes a list in his mind of all of Apollonius' supposed plans and actions which have been and are being, as Fritz mistakenly believes, directed against him: ". . . er [Fritz] dachte an Apollonius' Heimkunft gegen seinen Rath, an den Ball, an die Berathung auf dem Kirchenboden, an seine Verdrängung von der Reparatur, an den ganzen Plan des Bruders, an das, was davon ausgeführt, an das, was noch auszuführen war. Er dachte daran, dass Apollonius eben an dem Letzteren arbeite, und wie viel darauf ankomme, seine nächste Absicht zu errathen und zu vereiteln."[5] This passage also reveals Fritz's misunderstanding of Apollonius' motives, for Apollonius did not return to his home explicitly because of Christiane, nor did he wish to outshine Fritz at the ball, nor did he intend to threaten Fritz's authority by his advice in regard to the repairs of St. Georg and his supervision of these repairs and, finally, Apollonius has no secret plan against his brother to dispossess him of family and business.

Apollonius' question and Fritz's false reply that he knows no other reason for the strained relationship between them show the hopeless misunderstanding the two brothers have of each other even in this early section of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. Indeed, Ludwig's comment on Apollonius that he has not the remotest idea of what is passing through

---

[4] *Ibid.*, 77.

[5] *Ibid.*, 95.

Fritz's mind is only too true. "Apollonius sprach indess fort und hatte keine Ahnung von dem, was in dem Bruder vorging." [6] This remark about Apollonius is repeated often throughout the novel. It can even be found twice more in section six: "Er [Apollonius] würde den Bruder vielleicht für krank gehalten haben, so ohne die mindeste Ahnung von dem, was den Bruder dabei ängsten könne, als er war." [7] "Apollonius hatte keine Ahnung, wie ernst das lachende 'verwünscht' gemeint war." [8] Apollonius' failure to understand Fritz is also pointed out beforehand in section four where Ludwig compares their characters: "Er [Fritz] war bei sich einig, der Bruder hatte Mittel angewandt, die zu brauchen er selbst mit Genugthuung sich zu edel fühlte. Dadurch hatte jener die Leute ihm abspänstig gemacht. Apollonius hatte keine Ahnung von dem, was in dem Bruder vorging: . . ." [9] Later, in section nine, Apollonius perceives the estrangement between Fritz and Christiane and believes that he himself is the cause of it. Ludwig comments: "Es machte ihn [Apollonius] unglücklich, dass er die Schuld davon trug. In welcher Weise er sie trug, das ahnte er nicht." [10] Apollonius' inability to understand the effect of his efficiency and success on old Herr Nettenmair is summarized as follows: "Apollonius ahnte so wenig von dem Zwang, den er, ohne zu wollen, dem alten Herrn auflegte, als von dessen Stolz auf ihn." [11]

There are also several other phrases used as comments on Apollonius' misunderstanding of those about him, e.g., the oft-repeated "er dachte nicht" and "er wusste nicht" as in: "Er dachte nicht, dass man beleidigen kann, ohne zu wissen und zu wollen, ja, dass die Pflicht gebieten könne, zu beleidigen. Er dachte nicht, dass sein Bruder ihn beleidigt haben könnte. Er wüsste nicht, man könne auch den hassen, den man beleidigt, nicht bloss den Beleidiger." [12] Of Apollonius' hope that Fritz will overcome his drinking, squandering of money, and distrust of him, Ludwig writes: "Seine Hoffnung zeugt besser von seinem eigenen Herzen als von seiner Einsicht in das Gemüth des Bruders." [13] The hopelessness of the brothers' misunderstanding of each other is further revealed by the comment: "Aber was zwischen ihm [Apollonius] und dem Bruder stand, war ein Anderes, ein ganz Anderes, als er meinte. Und dass er es nicht kannte, machte es nur gefährlicher. . . . Was er that, die vermeinten Hindernisse aus dem Weg zu räumen, musste das wirkliche nur wachsen machen." [14] Even Apollonius' attempts to remove the misunderstanding which he senses between himself and Fritz only increase it. He is aware neither of the causes of the misunderstanding, nor of its extent. Finally, Ludwig sums up Apollonius' relationship to his father when he writes near the end of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*: "Die beiden so nah verwandten Menschen verstanden sich nicht." [15] This could also be said of the two brothers throughout the work.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, 95.

[7] *Ibid.*, 97.

[8] *Ibid.*, 99.

[9] *Ibid.*, 77.

[10] *Ibid.*, 123-124.

[11] *Ibid.*, 259-260.

[12] *Ibid.*, 64.

[13] *Ibid.*, 135.

These above quotations, which could be supplemented by many more, contrast strongly with Ludwig's insistence on Apollonius' need for clarity, one of the main differences between the brothers. Ludwig writes of Fritz in section four: "Ihm fehlte das Klarheitsbedürfniss Apollonius', das diesem den Widerspruch gezeigt und den erkannten zu tilgen gezwungen hätte" [16] and of Apollonius in section fifteen: ". . . die Klarheit . . ., das Grundbedürfniss seiner Natur." [17] If Ludwig were not so serious about Apollonius' need for clarity, the phrase would seem ironic since he is never entirely aware of what is happening. He at no time fully understands the other characters, not even at the end of the novel when a good deal of the confusion has been untangled. We have seen this above in regard to old Herr Nettenmair. Apollonius may have a need of clarity, but he is rarely able to satisfy this need. He notices conflicts and misunderstandings in the life of his family, as his conversation with Fritz in section six reveals, but he does not and cannot perceive the causes of these.[18]

Apollonius continues the conversation in section six by asking Fritz the reason for Christiane's behavior towards him and adds that if

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 72-73.

[15] *Ibid.*, 299.

[16] *Ibid.*, 74.

[17] *Ibid.*, 228.

[18] Thus we object to Elisabeth Witte's insistence on Apollonius' clarity (p. 69), indeed to her postulation of two forces, ". . . des Wilden, Unsteten, Unruhigen, Schwülen, Fiebrischen und Schmutzigen . . ." and ". . . des Festen, Reinen, Sichern . . ." (p. 68) which take possession of Fritz and Apollonius respectively. Later it will be argued that such *forces* play no role in Ludwig's novel (Elisabeth Witte, "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", diss. Göttingen, 1958).

Fritz knows no explanation they should go at once to ask her. Fritz misinterprets this to mean that his brother knows the state of his wife's feelings at the moment. Ännchen and Anne, the girl with whom Apollonius had danced at the ball and who is in love with him, had both rebuffed Christiane for her slighting of Apollonius. After this Christiane watches him when he is not aware of it and finds none of the faults of which Fritz had told her. Her love for Apollonius begins to awaken once more. Fritz knows that if Apollonius and Christiane now discuss their behavior toward each other, they will discover his deception of them. In an attempt to conceal his anxiety, he laughs and says: " 'Freilich! jovial fragen. Wer fragt, wird berichtet. Aber wie fällt dir das eben jetzt ein? Eben jetzt?' "[19] In this reply there is further evidence of Fritz's mistaken fear that Apollonius may know of Christiane's love for him and wish to take advantage of her feelings at the moment, e.g., in the involuntary repetition of "Eben jetzt?" and in the use of *jovial* which tell us that Fritz believes his brother would be asking a question to which he already knows the answer and would be concealing his malicious pleasure at this knowledge behind a mask of joviality.

Apollonius answers Fritz's question with a joy which, to Fritz, seems devilish and to express triumph at knowing the truth about Christiane. Apollonius says to his brother that he has not spoken with Christiane beforehand because he feared he would only make her more angry, which would, he naturally but wrongly assumes, have been as unwelcome to Fritz as to himself. Fritz laughs once more and affirms this "in seiner jovialen Weise".[20]

Fritz's laughter, which increases throughout the rest of the conversation, has the same significance as *jovial*. Apollonius joins in this laughter, because he believes that it, like his own, comes from genuine hope and joy that the situation between themselves and Christiane will become clear, that the misunderstanding will be removed from their relations with each other. Fritz's laughter, however, which approaches hysteria and causes him difficulty in speaking, arises from his desire to conceal under an assumed mask of joy his mistaken, but ever increasing anxiety that Apollonius may know or be about to discover Christiane's true feelings for him.[21]

---

[19] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 97.

[20] *Ibid.*, 98.

Apollonius continues the conversation in section six by stating his opinion that Christiane's attitude toward him has changed and that this is the reason for his wanting to approach her now. The tension and fear within Fritz increase to such a degree that he is unable to reply to his brother. His mind races from thought to thought and he realizes that a third person has given Apollonius information about Christiane. Apollonius guesses, for once, what Fritz is thinking and says that Ännchen had told him of Christiane's changed attitude. Ludwig comments: "Apollonius scheint ein Etwas von des Bruders unglückseliger Lesegabe angeflogen." [22] Fritz's "unglückselige Lesegabe" refers not only to his tendency to read into the other characters' actions motives which are not present. It also refers to his moments of insight into the erroneous nature of his own thoughts and actions and into the true motives and intentions of the other characters. Fritz is, however, unable to escape his misunderstanding for very long and these moments of insight are rare and fleeting.

Fritz's treatment of Christiane provides a good example of this. Although he knows the frankness and honesty of her character, he continually believes his wife capable of committing adultery with his brother. Fritz also knows that his attempts to turn her against Apollonius are having the opposite effect, but he is unable to desist from his course of action. In section seven Fritz tries to arouse Christiane's anger against Apollonius. He knows he will no longer be able to achieve this by slandering him but he nevertheless ridicules his brother to Christiane and is annoyed when his attempts produce the effect he had foreseen. Finally, Fritz tells his wife that she is guilty of an adulterous love for Apollonius and he momentarily triumphs because of her embarrassment and confusion. From section seven onwards Fritz torments his wife by reminding her continually of the adulterous nature of her love for his brother. Then, after Christiane convinces herself of the innocence of her love, Fritz further torments her by threatening to harm Apollonius.[23] The extent of Fritz's misunderstanding and self-delusion is startlingly evident when we perceive that he is attempting by such measures as the above to turn Christiane from Apollonius and to bring her closer to himself. For brief moments Fritz realizes that his persecution of Christiane is forcing her into Apollonius' arms, but he cannot desist from his course of action. At one moment he believes that what he wishes to prevent has already happened, that he is powerless to prevent it, at the next that he is more cunning than his wife and brother, that he will triumph over them.[24]

---

[21] In "Das Leitmotiv in Otto Ludwigs Erzählungen *Die Heiteretei* und *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", M. A. thesis, The Johns Hopkins University (1951), Lotte W. Forest makes an interesting point when she shows how Fritz's laughter is characterized by various adjectives: "Anfänglich ist sein Lachen 'jovial'. Es wird 'herablassend', dann 'verachtend', geht in 'wildes' Lachen über, steigert sich zum 'krampfhaften' und dann zum 'entsetzlichen' Lachen, wird als nächstes zum 'heulenden' Lachen und gipfelt in 'wahnwitzigem' Lachen" (p. 39). W. H. McClain also makes this same comment (*Between Real and Ideal*, p. 64). Neither Forest nor McClain, however, point out the actual significance of the laughter or the word "jovial". Reading Forest's and McClain's remarks, one would believe Fritz really was good-natured in the beginning.

[22] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 98.

Fritz's most penetrating moment of insight into his misunderstanding of Apollonius and Christiane and into the falseness of his own actions occurs when he discovers the dead body of Ännchen on the morning after he had struck his wife as she sat by the sick child's bedside. Fritz awakes from a dream of Apollonius' death with a feeling of satisfaction. What his dream was about he no longer knows and he wonders why he feels so content, since the quarrel with Christiane the night before was not likely to produce such a good mood in him. Fritz recalls Ännchen's, the "spy's", illness which he believes was merely a subterfuge so that his wife and his brother could be together.[25] On leaving the bedroom Fritz sees Ännchen's dead body: "Ein Schauder fasste ihn an. Da stand das todte Kind vor ihm wie ein Warnungszeichen: nicht weiter auf dem Wege, den du eingeschlagen hast!"[26] Fritz now knows that his wife's paleness and pleading expression the night before did not come from a feeling of guilt at having been with Apollonius, but from her fear for her sick child, and that there had never been any conspiracy between Apollonius and Christiane. Overcome by the outrageousness of his own actions, Fritz loses consciousness: "Dort lag er lang. Der Blitz, der ihn dahingestreckt, hatte zurückgeleuchtet mit grausamer Klarheit; er hatte die Beiden unschuldig gesehen, die er verfolgt. Und keine Schuld, als die seine. Er allein hat das Elend aufgethürmt, das erdrückend auf ihm liegt, Last auf Last, Schuld auf Schuld. Des Kindes Tod ist der Gipfel. Und vielleicht ist er es noch nicht! Der Elende sieht, er muss zurück." [27] Fritz is, however, unable to retain this insight for long. Christiane does not listen to her husband's appeals for reconciliation and he is once more a prey to his misunderstanding and confusion: "Die Klarheit des Blitzes müsste schwinden und der alte Wahn hüllte die Dinge wieder in seine verstellenden Nebel." [28]

---

[23] *Ibid.*, 173.
[24] *Ibid.*, 74, 133, etc.
[25] *Ibid.*, 163.
[26] *Ibid.*, 163.

When Fritz learns in section six that Ännchen has told Apollonius of the change in Christiane, he bursts out laughing once more and his brother laughs with him. We have already discussed the different significances of the laughter – the joy and hopefulness expressed by Apollonius' and the fear and malice behind Fritz's. This is again made evident here when we read of Fritz: "Und doch musste er noch über das Kind lachen, über das joviale Kind mit seinem 'verfluchten' Einfall." [29] The true significance of *jovial* and the laughter is again clear when we recall Fritz's thought in which he expresses his hatred of the informer before he learns her identity.[30] Further proof is that from this section on Fritz refers to Ännchen as the spy.[31]

Apollonius is, of course, aware of none of this. He does not perceive Fritz's true feelings in regard to Ännchen. "Apollonius hatte keine Ahnung, wie ernst das lachende 'verwünscht' gemeint war." [32] He believes his brother laughs because he is as glad as himself that Christiane's attitude has changed, whereas Fritz is actually bursting with almost irrepressible hatred and fear. Ludwig comments: "Der gute Apollonius freute sich so herzlich über des Bruders Freude!" [33] The irony in this remark stresses Apollonius' inability to understand Fritz, his misinterpretation of almost all of Fritz's motives and actions. While Apollonius is joyful because of the supposed improvement in his relationship with his brother, Fritz is plotting to thwart his plan to speak with Christiane and, thus, to prevent them from obtaining a clear understanding of each other.

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 164.
[28] *Ibid.*, 168.
[29] *Ibid.*, 99.
[30] *Ibid.*, 98.
[31] *Ibid.*, 114, 138, 149, 163.
[32] *Ibid.*, 99.
[33] *Ibid.*

Regarding section six as a whole, we find that at its commencement Apollonius is determined to overcome the misunderstanding between Christiane, Fritz, and himself. He is also determined not to be distracted from this by his brother. However, by the end of the section the very thing which Apollonius was determined not to let happen has happened. By his laughter and mask of cheerfulness, Fritz distracts Apollonius from his intention to talk with Christiane immediately and to clarify the situation between them. There is considerable irony in this reversal of Apollonius' express wishes without his being aware of it. This irony emphasizes once more the impossibility of Apollonius pursuing a course of action which will enable him to clear away his misunderstanding of the other characters. Even when he perceives that misunderstanding exists and is determined to overcome it, he proves unequal to the task and only sinks deeper into confusion without realizing it. In section six Fritz wins and his victory means increased misunderstanding of his brother on his own part and further confusion about Fritz and Christiane on Apollonius'.

II

The extent of the brothers' misunderstanding of reality is made evident by a consideration of their dreams and visions.

When Apollonius returns from Cologne, he finds his home and family greatly changed. Ludwig shows us his inner disturbance by describing his dream about these changed circumstances.[34] Apollonius' second dream,[35] however, is of a different nature. He dreams that when Christiane rushes into his arms, he presses her to him and, in order to keep her love, pushes his brother from the steeple of St.

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 55-56.

[35] *Ibid.*, 243.

Georg. The second dream occurs after the actual incident with Christiane, but before Fritz's death. This dream differs from the first in that the events which take place in it do occur in reality, but not exactly in the same way as they occur in the dream. Apollonius had rejected Christiane, placing his duty to his brother above his love for his brother's wife. The reversal of the actual event in Apollonius' dream is intended to show the reader once more the intensity of Apollonius' love for Christiane which his conscious will and sense of honor force him to suppress. More important, however, is Apollonius' dream version of his brother's death, an event which has not yet taken place. In the actual scene of Fritz's death, it is Fritz who wishes to push Apollonius from the steeple and it is Fritz who is responsible for his own death. Apollonius does not push his brother, but springs aside as he rushes at him. Apollonius is aware of the difference between the dream interpretation and reality when he tries to free himself from his sense of guilt in regard to marrying Christiane after his brother's death: "So war's schon in seinem Traume, als er mit dem Bruder kämpfte um sie, und ihn hinabstiess von der fliegenden Rüstung in den Tod. Er sagt sich, das war nur im Traum; was man im Traume that, hat man nicht gethan." [36] Thus, the misunderstanding of reality goes so far that even Apollonius' dream, which, within the framework of the novel, appears as the unconscious foreseeing of an approaching event, proves to be incorrect.[37]

Fritz's vision and dream provide further examples of this. When the "Geselle" is forced to leave the village, Fritz accompanies him for part of the way. The Geselle makes a veiled threat that he will kill Apollonius and, left alone, Fritz stares into the mist and has a vision of a funeral, Apollonius' funeral.[38] However, here there is once more the same partly false perception of a future event as in Apollonius' dream, for it is Fritz who will die and it is Fritz's funeral procession, not Apollonius', which will later pass along the path where Fritz has his vision. There is considerable irony in the reversal of the desired event in reality and Ludwig does not fail to point this out when describing Fritz's funeral: "Es war derselbe Weg, den Fritz Nettenmair zurückging, nachdem er den Gesellen begleitet hatte. Damals sah er im Geiste den Bruder unter dem Deckhammer und dem wallenden schwarzen Behänge und er ging leidtragend hinter ihm drein. Nun war's umgekehrt Wirklichkeit geworden, . . ." [39] This reversal of the visional interpretation in reality suggests that all Fritz's attempts to grasp reality are in vain, that, as Ludwig comments, reality will always turn out to be the opposite of what he wishes and believes.

---

[36] *Ibid.*, 271.

[37] We are not attempting to ascribe to Ludwig any belief in the possibility of foreseeing the future here. As will be shown later (cf. page 77 ff.), the discrepancies between the characters' visions of the future and the actual future events are employed as an artistic device to express certain motifs of the novel.

[38] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 150-152.

After Fritz strikes Christiane during the scene at Ännchen's bedside, he dreams of Apollonius working on the church steeple and hopes, at first in vain, that his brother will fall to his death.[40] Suddenly the noise caused by the opening and closing of a door (as the members of the family and the doctor attend to Ännchen) penetrates Fritz's dream and seems to him the thud of a body falling from a great height. Fritz's unconscious mind interprets this as signifying Apollonius' death. Fritz is here, however, doubly mistaken. It is he himself, not his brother, who will fall to his death and it is Ännchen's death with which the noise of the door has a connection, again not with his brother's.[41]

Fritz's misunderstanding is, once more, full of irony and this emphasizes the hopelessness of his position, his inability to obtain a valid picture of reality. His contentment is induced by the knowledge that a death has taken place. It is, however, not Apollonius who has died, as Fritz believes and so greatly desires, but Ännchen, and it is her death which causes Christiane to turn completely away from her husband,[42] thus depriving him of the one person who might have helped him overcome the misunderstanding and confusion which lead to his insanity, his attack on Apollonius, and his own death.

[39] *Ibid.*, 253.
[40] *Ibid.*, 159-160.
[41] *Ibid.*, 160.
[42] *Ibid.*, 166-167.

CHAPTER IV

THE MAIN CAUSE OF THE MISUNDERSTANDING OF REALITY

The question must now be asked as to how this misunderstanding of reality comes about. The most obvious cause is Fritz's deception of Christiane and Apollonius concerning their feelings for each other. Since Apollonius believes Fritz when the latter tells him that Christiane does not love him, he cannot know the correct explanation for Christiane's and Fritz's actions. The same is true of Christiane. It is not until she discovers Apollonius' letters to Fritz that she understands her husband's and his brother's past attitudes towards her. This argument as to the cause of the misunderstanding, advocated by W. H. McClain,[1] does not, however, explain why, for example, Apollonius at no time understands his father, nor why Apollonius and Fritz have partly false perceptions of actual events of the future in their dreams. Fritz's deception of Apollonius and Christiane obviously contributes to their misunderstanding of each other, but is there any more basic cause of the misunderstanding of reality in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*?

Let us examine a comment on the two brothers which the narrator makes in section six: "Fritz Nettenmair that, was Apollonius eben gethan; er mass den Bruder in seinen Gedanken nach sich." [2] Here is the main reason for Fritz's and Apollonius' misunderstanding in section six and for their misunderstanding of each other and the other characters throughout the novel. Each incorrectly assumes, on almost all occasions, that the other is exactly the same as he himself is, that the other will act in almost any given situation exactly the same as he himself will.

---

[1] *Between Real and Ideal*, 65.

[2] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 96.

At the beginning of section six, we read of Fritz's thoughts about Apollonius. He believes his brother is capable of the same treachery and deceit of which he himself is and, therefore, excuses his own treachery and deceit as necessary self-defense. Fritz's whole attitude to Apollonius in section six and indeed throughout the novel is based on this assumption. When Fritz constantly fears Apollonius will steal Christiane from him, he is ascribing his own treachery to Apollonius. Fritz believes his brother is capable of taking Christiane from him as he himself had taken her from his brother, whereas Apollonius, when he has the opportunity to do so, is prevented by his sense of honor.[3]

Fritz's misinterpretation of Apollonius' laughter in section six is also caused by his assumption that his brother is not different from himself. He assumes that Apollonius is laughing for the same reason he himself would, were he in what he believes is his brother's position. Apollonius' laughter seems to him to express triumph at the knowledge of Christiane's love.[4] At this stage, however, Apollonius is unaware that Christiane loves him.

That Fritz is exactly the same as himself is also Apollonius' assumption. Apollonius expects his brother to enter into their conversation with the same frankness and with the same desire to solve the problems of their relationship with Christiane. What he himself wishes, Fritz will wish; how he acts, Fritz will act, is Apollonius' conviction. Indeed, he is so incapable of believing that Fritz can be other than himself, he would think he was mistaken if he perceived Fritz's falseness: 'Apollonius liess die beabsichtigte Einleitung weg. Er hatte klug und vorsichtig sein gelernt, aber klug und vorsichtig gegen einen Bruder sein, hätte ihm Falschheit geschienen. Selbst, hätte er die Falschheit des Bruders gekannt, er wäre nicht auf dessen Gedanken von den gleichen Waffen gekommen. Er hätte sich seine Erfahrung als Täuschung ausgeredet." [5] "Dafür würde Apollonius in des Bruders Antlitz ein Etwas von Teufelsangst ertappt haben, hätte dieser es ihm zugewandt. Und vielleicht dennoch nicht. Er würde den Bruder vielleicht für krank gehalten haben, so ohne die mindeste Ahnung von dem, was den Bruder dabei ängsten könne, als er war. Ja, was ihn freute, musste ja auch den Bruder freun." [6]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, 226ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, 97-98.

[5] *Ibid.*, 94-95.

Apollonius' belief that Fritz is not different from himself is also the explanation for his misinterpretation of Fritz's laughter. Whereas Apollonius is convinced that his brother laughs for the same reason he himself does, namely from relief and joy that the misunderstanding will be removed from their relationship,[7] Fritz is actually laughing to conceal his fear that Apollonius may succeed, if he has not already succeeded, in clearing up the situation between himself and Christiane, and may thus take Christiane from him.[8]

The main cause of the misunderstanding in section six, then, is Apollonius' and Fritz's inability to transcend a subjective and false interpretation of reality. In other words, the misunderstanding is caused by their inability to transcend self, by their *isolation in self*. This is also true of almost all the misunderstanding throughout *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It is true of Herr Nettenmair's and Apollonius' misunderstanding of each other and is also the explanation for Fritz's and Apollonius' partly false perceptions of future events in their dreams, as will be shown in the following chapters.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, 97.

[7] *Ibid.*, 99-100.

[8] *Ibid.*, 98-99.

CHAPTER V

THE MOTIF OF ISOLATION AND THE ARTISTIC DEVICES EMPLOYED TO EXPRESS IT

It is our contention that the dominant motif in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is that of isolation. The term isolation, however, is a very broad one. It may, among many other meanings, suggest a state of withdrawal from human society caused by melancholy or by a desire to live the life of a hermit communing with nature and the divine. The loneliness of the disappointed lover, the withdrawal of the saint or the mystic, and the Romantic's longing for "Einsamkeit" come to mind. None of these are, however, the form of isolation present in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.*

There are two related features of the major characters, Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius, which Ludwig emphasizes throughout his novel. These can best be described and their relationship shown by classifying them under the one term, *isolation*. The reader's attention is drawn very early to the first of these features. When Apollonius goes to Cologne he perceives an important difference between the Cousin's family and his own family: "Er [Apollonius] fand ein ganz anderes Zusammenleben als daheim. Der alte Vetter war so lebenslustig als das jüngste Glied der Familie. Da war keine Vereinsamung möglich." [1] This "Vereinsamung" which, as we are explicitly told, exists in the Nettenmair family, i.e., among Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius, is more closely defined here by the word "Zusammenleben" which is a leitmotif used of the family throughout the novel.[2] In the true sense of the word, the Nettenmairs have no life together.

---

[1] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 24.

[2] *Ibid.*, e.g., 6, 7, 24, 39, 102, 303, This leitmotif will be analysed also later on in reference to the various characters of whom it is used.

Although each is surrounded by other people, he has no contact with them. Each is actually alone. This is not a matter of isolation caused by withdrawal from human society, but, living in human society, an inability to communicate with others.

The second feature of Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius which may also be described by the term isolation is the one referred to in the preceding chapter as the cause of the widespread misunderstanding among the three major characters, namely, their interpretation of people and events from a purely subjective and, therefore, false point of view, their inability to transcend self.

In this chapter, the motif of isolation will be discussed in regard to Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius. Of each of them it will firstly be shown that they have none but a superficial contact with the people about them and secondly that, *except on rare occasions*, they are caught within a subjective and false interpretation of the events in which and the people with whom they are involved, that they are imprisoned within a subjective and false perception of reality. It will also be asked in regard to all three whether their isolation increases during the course of the novel. Apart from these basic points, there are others related to the motif of isolation which must be raised in reference to one or more of the characters. Thus in regard to Herr Nettenmair we shall also consider how the motif of his sense of honor is connected with that of isolation. Fritz's inability to transcend self, will be shown largely by an examination of the leitmotifs used of him and by an analysis of the function in the novel of his vision and dream. Apollonius' imprisonment in self will be revealed by considering the problem of why he does not marry Christiane and by pointing out the function in the novel of his second dream. Thus the significance of the end of the novel will become clear, as well as the connection of Apollonius' pedantic correctness and feelings of guilt with the motif of isolation. Finally, at the end of the section concerning Apollonius, the descriptions of him and his father in their gardens will be analysed to discover whether the critic is justified in interpreting these as portrayals of human beings communing with nature.

1. HERR NETTENMAIR

I

Herr Nettenmair has at all times none but a superficial contact with his sons and the other people about him. He is described as a brooding, distant, tyrannical, domineering man who delivers commands to his family in a voice of thunder like the wrathful god of the Hebrews.[3] His abrupt, harsh, impersonal way of speaking characterizes him well. " 'Morgen gehst du zum Vetter nach Köln' ",[4] he orders Apollonius and, when his son silently assents, the narrator remarks that the father seems almost disappointed there is no defiance for him to overcome.

Herr Nettenmair tolerates no contradiction. Once given, his commands must be carried out even if he himself knows they are incorrect. When Apollonius asks Fritz why their father has ordered him to end his friendship with Beate, Fritz replies rather bitterly: " 'Ja, hast du je gehört, dass der im blauen Rock ein Warum vorgebracht hätte? Und hast du ihn je gefragt: warum denn aber, Vater? Ich möchte sein Gesicht sehen, fragte ihn einer von uns: Warum? . . .' "[5] Nettenmair's tyrannical treatment of his sons, before he becomes blind and can no longer actively rule the family and the business, permits no close contact, no understanding in their relationship. Apollonius still respects his father, but Fritz mocks him and is bitter towards him because he commanded Fritz not to see Beate again as her family's financial position was poor.

Valentin is Herr Nettenmair's constant companion, especially when he becomes blind, but here too there is no desire for a close relationship on Nettenmair's side. The narrator comments: ". . . der alte Herr machte sich nicht so gemein mit dem alten Gesellen [Valentin], über Dinge mit ihm zu sprechen, die ihm den Vorwand bieten konnten, in irgend eine Art Vertraulichkeit gegen ihn zu verfallen."[6] Nettenmair is not completely devoid of human feelings, but he is incapable of expressing and revealing these. He cannot bridge the gulf between himself and those about him. Ludwig even comments as narrator that this inability to open one's heart to others, this reserve, is a family characteristic which Apollonius and his father have in common: "Und was diese Missverständnisse verursachte und begünstigte, das Zurückhalten, war eben der Familienzug, den sie beide gemein hatten." [7] The father especially suppresses his feelings and conceals his thoughts from those about him. "Der alte Herr rückte seinen Schirm tiefer in sein Gesicht, um Niemand die Gedanken sehen zu lassen, die da wunderlich mit einander kämpften." [8] "Er trat dem Sohn um einen Schritt näher. Es war wie ein Kampf in ihm. Er wollte etwas sagen, das Niemand hören sollte, als der Sohn. Aber er schwieg." [9] Ludwig questions what the reason can be for Nettenmair's concealment of his thoughts and feelings from others, as though the old man is so locked in self he is impenetrable even for his author: "Warum er unterdrückt, was er dem Ankömmling [Apollonius] sagen wollte? War es vom Geschäft oder von der Ehre des Hauses?" [10] No character in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is aware of what is happening within Nettenmair. No character penetrates the cold, indifferent exterior which conceals the instability and the violent emotions of his inner world. "Je heisser es in ihm kochte, desto eisiger erschien sein Aeusseres." [11] Ludwig, as narrator, also explicitly comments: "Der alte Herr, der dem Gast, wie jedem Andern, sein Inneres verbarg, . . ." [12] Indeed, Nettenmair is so locked in self that he has no contact with the world about him, as is repeatedly emphasized: "Der alter Herr sass in seiner kleinen Stube. Wie er sich immer tiefer in die Wolken einspann, die ihn von der Welt ausser ihm trennten, wurde ihm zuletzt auch das Gärtchen fremd." [13] "Der alte Herr hat sich so tief in die Wolke eingesponnen, dass kein Weg mehr von ihm herausführt in die Welt um ihn und keiner mehr hinein." [14]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, 24.
[4] *Ibid.*, 22.
[5] *Ibid.*, 15.
[6] *Ibid.*, 45.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 299.

[8] *Ibid.*, 61.

[9] *Ibid.*, 47.

[10] *Ibid.*, 48.

[11] *Ibid.*, 189.

[12] *Ibid.*, 189.

[13] *Ibid.*, 188.

[14] *Ibid.*, 82. There is a similar comment on Dorle in *Die Heiterethei*: "Es ist, als führte kein Weg mehr aus ihrer Seele in die Welt! Immer weiter aussen ist die Welt, immer tiefer drinn die Seele" (*Die Heiterethei und Ihr Wider-*

II

Nettenmair is also isolated in the sense that he, like Fritz and Apollonius in section six, constantly judges everyone by himself and has no true knowledge or understanding of them. This is especially noticeable in his relationship with Apollonius. When the latter returns from Cologne and reveals how efficient he has become, Nettenmair is at first pleased. However, he is prevented from giving expression to his pride and pleasure, he is prevented from achieving close contact with his son because he fears his efficiency. The father presupposes in Apollonius his own desire to control and his own picture of himself as a helpless, blind, old man who is no longer capable of accomplishing anything. Ludwig tells us of Nettenmair's thoughts: ". . . er [Herr Nettenmair himself] konnte nichts dagegen thun; er konnte nichts mehr, er war nichts mehr. Und als hätte Apollonius das ausgesprochen, erhob er sich straff, wie um zu zeigen, jener triumphire zu früh." [15] "Der alte Herr sah nur immer mehr die Furcht wahr gemacht, die ihm Apollonius' Tüchtigkeit erregt hatte. Apollonius hatte ihm die Gefahr unkindlich verschwiegen, um die Rettung sich allein beimessen zu können. Oder er hielt seinen Vater für den hülflosen Blinden, der nichts mehr war und nichts mehr vermochte, als höchstens ihn zu hindern. Und das vergab ihm der alte Herr noch weniger." [16] Ludwig is most insistent that Herr Nettenmair misunderstands Apollonius because he judges him by himself. The father's failure to perceive that his son wishes neither to triumph over his helplessness nor to take control of the family and the business from him against his will is explained explicitly as follows: "Er [Herr Nettenmair] sah hinter der vorgegebenen Schonung des Sohnes um so natürlicher Eigenmächtigkeit und die Lust, ein verdecktes Spiel zu spielen, als er ihn dabei nur an dem eigenen Masstabe mass. Er war des Nächstliegende, dass er in dem Sohne die eigenen Neigungen voraussetzte." [17] The same comment was made of Fritz and Apollonius in section six.[18]

---

spiel, Frankfurt a. M., 1857, p. 348). Dorle, however, is drawn out of her isolation by Holders-Fritz when he accidentally learns that she loves him.

[15] *Ibid.*, 62.

[16] *Ibid.*, 194. Cf. also p. 258.

[17] *Ibid.*, 256.

[18] *Ibid.*, 96.

Towards the end of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Ludwig once more considers the cause of the deep-rooted misunderstanding between Apollonius and his father. On the morning before he refuses to obey his father's command to marry Christiane (the first time he has ever openly contradicted him), Apollonius receives a visit from the town-councillors who praise him for his bravery during the storm. Nettenmair interprets the effect of this visit on Apollonius in the light of his son's subsequent refusal to obey him as follows: such a distinction and such praise are sufficient to cause an ambitious person to be arrogant; Apollonius is such an ambitious person who always wants to command and to prove that he is indispensable. Nettenmair also believes that the visit of the town-councillors arouses his son's desire to force an admission of his superiority over his father. This is, of course, a completely false interpretation of Apollonius and his motives. He does not refuse to marry Christiane in order to prove that his father has no longer any control over him. He does this for another reason which will be discussed later on. What Nettenmair is doing here is once more reading his own desire to command, his own need to be indispensable into his son's actions. Ludwig explicitly comments on this: ". . . der Alte sah in der Weigerung des Sohnes und dessen Beweis, er könne der schwierigen Lage des Hauses gerecht werden, nur den alten Trotz auf seine Unentbehrlichkeit, der es nun nicht einmal mehr der Mühe werth hielt, zu verbergen: der Vater war in seinen Augen nichts mehr, als ein hülfloser alter blinder Mann." [19] Apollonius, however, constantly tries to spare his father's feelings and to make him see the errors in his decisions as diplomatically as possible. It is only in Nettenmair's own eyes that he is a helpless, blind, old man whom it is not even worth the trouble to humor any more. The father is also the only person who regards his blindness as something of which he should be ashamed. He misunderstands his son because he is unaware that Apollonius is not the same as himself.

Nettenmair is, however, not only of the opinion that Apollonius, but also that everyone else regards him as a helpless, blind, old man. Another leitmotif is employed to reveal this fact. The father constantly attempts to pass over his blindness by replying to all enquiries about his health: "'Ich leide etwas an den Augen, aber es hat nichts zu sagen.'" One of the reasons for Nettenmair's withdrawal from the garden to his room is that he feels no one believes his answer any more: "Der alte Herr sass in seiner kleinen Stube. Wie er sich immer tiefer in die Wolken einspann, die ihn von der Welt ausser ihm trennten, wurde ihm zuletzt auch das Gärtchen fremd. Besonders hatte ihn die ewige Frage: Wie geht's Herr Nettenmair? dort vertrieben. Er fühlte, man konnte ihm sein 'Ich leide etwas an den Augen, aber es hat nichts zu sagen', nicht mehr glauben, und seitdem hörte er in jener Frage eine Verhöhnung." [20] Nettenmair's shame and need to conceal his blindness, which the leitmotif expresses,[21] reveal his loss of contact with the world about him, for it is obvious to everyone else that he is blind and no one except Nettenmair himself regards this as something of which to be ashamed.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, 299.

The subjective and false picture of reality which the father has formed prevents him from revealing his emotions to other people, from asking questions which would reveal his inner world (another leitmotif used of Nettenmair is "aber er fragt nicht"),[22] which would enable others to understand him and which might permit the establishment of a close relationship. If he did so, Nettenmair fears he would only strengthen the supposed general opinion of him as a helpless, blind, old man who is capable of accomplishing nothing.[23]

III

A major difference between Nettenmair and the Cousin in Cologne is the former's tendency to take certain virtues to extremes. An example of this is Nettenmair's exaggerated sense of honor. This is the shaky prop with which he holds up his world and also the unreliable measure by which he judges people and events. If the motif of the father's honor is examined, it becomes apparent that it too is symptomatic of his isolation in self.

---

[20] *Ibid.*, 188.

[21] This leitmotif, or part of it, also occurs on pp. 47, 61, 198, 199, 208, etc.

[22] *Ibid.*, e.g., 82, 83, 112, 190.

[23] *Ibid.*, 82-83.

Nettenmair is most insistent that the honor of his family be preserved, but the actions he undertakes to accomplish this end reveal that he himself has a rather superficial conception of honor. He does not evince "a fine sense of and strict allegiance to what is due or right".[24] His demand that Fritz commit suicide to hush up a scandal is proof of this, as is also Ludwig's comment on the contradiction between Nettenmair's pretence and his sense of honor when he attempts to convince Valentin that he already knew all about the conflict between Apollonius and Fritz before Valentin informed him of it.[25] The old man is here attempting to deceive Valentin, to conceal the truth, for he had not the slightest idea of Fritz's plan to murder Apollonius. Indeed, all Nettenmair's actions to preserve the honor of his family, or rather his own honor, are in themselves dishonorable, because they are intended to hide the truth, to avoid what is right and due. The old man's sense of honor, then, is also symptomatic of his inability to reveal his problems and open his heart to other people. His natural reaction in any situation is to *conceal* what he knows, what he fears or what he is thinking because he has no trust in and no true knowledge of other people, whom he falsely considers to be against him. Nettenmair is thus locked in self.

The need to preserve his honor unsullied becomes an *idée fixe* with the old man. It is the thought which constantly dominates his mind and occupies his fears. We read of his "krankhaft geschärftes Ehrgefühl" [26] and of "die krankhaft gewachsene Empfindlichkeit seines Ehrgefühls".[27] The father sees the actions of the members of his family from this viewpoint and thus reads a false meaning into them. When, for example, Fritz falls to his death in a second attempt to kill Apollonius, Nettenmair believes his son committed suicide in order to save the honor of the family.[28] His interpretation of events and people from the standpoint of his *idée fixe* distorts them and gives him a subjective and false picture of reality. The father assumes Fritz has done what he would have were he in his son's position. Nettenmair was beforehand willing to grasp Fritz and jump with him from the steeple of St. Georg to hush up the scandal about Apollonius' supposed death.[29] He is thus ascribing to Fritz his own sense of honor, whereas Fritz has none.

---

[24] *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary.*

[25] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 193.

[26] *Ibid.*, 83.

[27] *Ibid.*, 192.

[28] *Ibid.*, 250, 299.

IV

Nettenmair's isolation increases during the course of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. His withdrawal from the garden to his room is an indication of this as is the blindness which overcomes him. This blindness symbolizes his isolation in self, his gradual loss of contact with everything outside of him. His groping attempts to orientate himself in a physical world he can no longer see stand for his vain efforts to overcome his isolation, to grasp reality and to achieve contact with those about him.

Nettenmair also increasingly reads a meaning into events which do not have the importance he ascribes to them and, since he never discusses his fears with anyone, he has no means of correcting his subjective and false view: "Er lauscht, wo er weiss, man sieht ihn nicht lauschen, fieberisch gespannt auf jeden Laut. Aus jedem hört er etwas heraus, was nicht drin ist; seine gespannte Phantasie baut Felsen daraus, die ihm die Brust zerdrücken, aber er fragt nicht." [30] "Der alte Herr im blauen Rock hatte schlimmere Träume, als je; er horchte gespannter, als je, auf jeden flüchtigen Laut, hörte mehr heraus, und baute immer grössere Lasten über seine Brust. Aber er fragte nicht." [31] The danger of Nettenmair's condition is summed up by Ludwig as narrator when he writes: "Es war ein Zustand, der in völligen Wahnsinn übergehen musste, wenn nicht die Aussenwelt eine Brücke zu ihm schlug und ihn mit Gewalt aus seiner Vereinzelung heraus riss." [32] Here, the old man's isolation is expressly pointed out and the possible consequence of complete alienation, insanity, is indicated. Nettenmair is, however, saved from becoming insane by Valentin who tells him of the true state of affairs between Apollonius and Fritz. He is thus given the chance to escape from his fears and must no longer confine his plans and measures merely to thoughts.[33] By being forced to act and being thrust into the external world, Nettenmair somewhat regains his grasp on reality: "Der alte Herr hatte den festen Boden der Wirklichkeit wieder unter seinen Füssen." [34] However, after Fritz's death, the father attempts to take control of the family business once more, but is no longer able to cope with it and is forced by circumstances to admit Apollonius' greater capability. Nettenmair withdraws again into his isolation, as is revealed by his renewed belief that everyone considers him a helpless, blind, old man.[35]

---

[29] *Ibid.*, 207-210.

[30] *Ibid.*, 82.

[31] *Ibid.*, 112.

[32] *Ibid.*, 189.

Herr Nettenmair, then, has no contact with and no true understanding of his family or other human beings. He is alone, even though surrounded by other people. He is isolated in self, in the narrow confines of his subjectivity which allows him to form only a false picture of reality.

2. FRITZ NETTENMAIR

I

It has already been shown that Fritz has no close relationship with his brother and father, that although he lives with them, he has no true knowledge or understanding of them. Is the situation at all different in his relationship with the other characters? It would perhaps be expected that Fritz would be bound to Christiane, his wife, by ties of love. To obtain her he was, after all, willing to deceive his brother. However, of Christiane's and Fritz's married life we read: "Sie haben Jahre zusammengelebt, sind nebeneinander gegangen, ihre Seelen wussten nichts voneinander." [36] Thus, in the true significance of the word, Christiane and Fritz have not lived together, but have lived "past" each other. Fritz loved Christiane superficially, the only way he could love her,[37] and it is not until he is about to lose her, that he realizes what degree of devotion he could have aroused in her had he wanted to. "Er [Fritz] fühlt erst, was er besass, ohne es zu haben, nun es einem Andern gehört. Mit welcher Empfindung sieht er die Knospe ihres Angesichts sich entfalten, die er schon für die Blume hielt! Welch niegeahnter Himmel öffnet sich da, wo er sonst Genüge hatte, sein eigen Spiegelbild zu finden." [38] This passage is important in that it further shows the egocentricity of Fritz's love, his misunderstanding of Christiane's true nature, his original lack of interest in discovering her human qualities and receiving her selfless love in return for his own. Indeed, as Ludwig explicitly states, Fritz was content to find in Christiane a mere reflection of himself. This inability to fulfill a love relationship which would demand that Fritz transcend self is one of the strongest indications of his isolation.

---

[33] *Ibid.*, 189-190.
[34] *Ibid.*, 190.
[35] *Ibid.*, 299-300.
[36] *Ibid.*, 102.
[37] *Ibid.*

Fritz has no love for his children and they, as a reaction against his attitude, finally have none for him. He causes Ännchen's death and regards her as a "spy" for Apollonius, although, ironically, she is the very one of his children who sought his love.[39] Fritz's two sons are frightened of him and reject the offer of reconciliation which he makes before his supposed departure for America. To them their father is "fremder als fremd." [40]

The only person with whom Fritz retains any close ties is the journeyman-slater whom he employs to watch Christiane and Apollonius. This relationship is, however, prompted by mutual hatred of Apollonius and does nothing toward relieving Fritz's isolation. He is even glad when the journeyman leaves for another town.[41]

II

Fritz, like his father, is unable to transcend self in the sense that he can rarely go beyond a purely subjective, and therefore, false experience of reality. This has already been touched upon in the discussion of the cause of the two brother's misunderstanding of each other in section six. There are further passages in the novel which support the claim that Fritz's misunderstanding of the other characters is brought about by his imprisonment in self.

---

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] *Ibid.*, 157 and 237.

[40] *Ibid.*, 238.

[41] *Ibid.*, 151.

When Fritz takes over his father's position as head of the business, he attempts to be more of a tyrant than his father was in order to obtain the same respect, but he does not perceive the quality which made people esteem Herr Nettenmair, namely "die ruhige, in sich gefasste Würde einer tüchtigen Persönlichkeit".[42] Ludwig explains Fritz's lack of insight into this: "Wie er [Fritz] es selbst nicht besass, fehlte ihm auch der Sinn, es an Andern wahrzunehmen." [43] Usually, Fritz can perceive in other people only those characteristics which he himself possesses. He is mostly unaware of possibilities of human behavior other than his own and judges all people and their actions by what his would be in the same situation.

Further evidence of this can be found when Fritz, after the meeting to discuss the repairs of St. Georg, gives vent to his suspicions and fears about Apollonius' supposedly treacherous intentions in regard to Christiane and himself. Here he is once more ascribing his own extreme unscrupulousness to his brother and we read: "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" [44] Fritz's imprisonment in his own subjectivity, his isolation in self is expressly pointed out by this comment. It is also, as was indicated before, a variation of one of the leitmotifs used of Fritz.

III

It is a consistently emphasized fact in studies of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and, indeed, of Ludwig's narrative works in general that the leitmotif was one of his favorite artistic devices. As far as *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is concerned, however, the critics have in the main merely contented themselves with pointing out the frequency of the leitmotifs and with making general statements about them. No critic has explained in detail their function in the structure of the novel as a whole.[45] Typical of this are Oskar Walzel's remarks. In a chapter entitled "Leitmotive in Dichtungen" of *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*[46] and later of *Das Wortkunstwerk*,[47] Walzel, drawing analogies between musical and poetical structure, discusses the leitmotif and certain of its occurrences in, amongst others, Ludwig's works. He firstly defines three possible types of leitmotif in reference to Dickens: "Die Unterscheidungen, die ich versuche, sind für Dickens' Erzählkunst sehr wichtig. Dickens bringt die Wiederholung erstens als blosses Schmuckmotiv, er gibt seinen Personen Visitenkarten mit auf den Weg. Er nutzt zweitens die Wiederholung, um seinem Bericht ein Mehr, sei's inhaltlicher, sei's formaler Wirkung zu geben. Er verwertet endlich die Wiederholung im Sinn der Baukunst des Erzählers." [48] Walzel attempts to substantiate the validity of his categories by examining the leitmotifs in the works of several novelists, e.g., Goethe, E.T.A. Hoffmann, Zola, and Ludwig. No examples of the second and third types of the leitmotif are given by Walzel from *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, but the following are quoted as illustrations of the first, the calling-card type: "Apollonius in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* bürstet den Rockkragen. Sein Bruder Fritz zieht die

---

[42] *Ibid.*, 76.

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] *Ibid.*, 65.

---

[45] E.g., in *Die epischen Werke Otto Ludwigs und ihr Verhältnis zu Charles Dickens* (Leipzig, 1910), Fritz Lüder simply lists the leitmotifs (p. 128ff.). Similarly, Lotte W. Forest writes in "Das Leitmotiv in Otto Ludwigs Erzählungen *Die Heiterethei* und *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", M.A. thesis, The Johns Hopkins University (1951): "In allem ist er [Apollonius] das gerade Gegenteil von seinem Bruder Fritz. Wenn Apollonius brav und geduldig ist, ist Fritz ein Trinker und wild. Ist Apollonius bescheiden, so leidet Fritz an Ehrsucht, ist der jüngere Bruder gehorsam gegen den Vater, so ist der Ältere voller Trotz. Diese Eigenschaften drücken sich in den Leitmotiven aus, die dem Fritz vom Dichter beigegeben sind. Er, Fritz, hält sich für einen, 'der die Welt kennt' (9 mal) und 'mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt' (7 mal). 'Er steckt die Hände in die Beinkleidertaschen und klappert mit dem Gelde darin' (3 mal), er benimmt sich so 'jovial' als möglich (ungefähr 20 mal) und 'die bedeutenden Leute, die seinen Champagner trinken' sagen deshalb (7 mal) 'Ei, da ist er ja! da ist er ja! Nun wird's famos!' " (pp. 28-29). If Forest had recognized the true significance and function of Fritz's leitmotifs, she would have perceived, as we shall try to show, that basically they emphasize a characteristic the two brothers have in common, rather than differences in their natures.

[46] Oskar Walzel, *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*, as *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, III (Berlin, 1923), 358-364.

[47] Oskar Walzel, *Das Wortkunstwerk* (Leipzig, 1926), 152-181.

[48] *Das Wortkunstwerk*, 160.

Schultern in die Höhe oder steckt die Hände in die Hosentaschen und klappert mit dem Gelde. Er versichert immer wieder, dass er die Welt kenne und mit der Art umzugehen wisse, die lange Haare und Schürzen trägt. Aber Ludwig bringt diese Wiederholungen doch wohl immer mit dem Stich ins Ironische, der einer humoristischen Darstellung im Sinne von Dickens eigen ist. Das gilt auch von den Stellen des Romans *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, die mit typischen Wendungen oder Gebärden arbeiten." [49] It is undeniable that some of the leitmotifs in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* are of Walzel's first type, as he here points out, but it is our contention that Fritz's leitmotif, "Ich bin einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare und Schürzen trägt", and its frequent variations are much more than a calling-card. It is indeed ironic, but not in the sense of humorous as Walzel maintains. Contrary to Walzel's opinion, it is, as we shall try to show, perhaps the most important leitmotif used of Fritz and is better included under Walzel's second and third categories.[50]

---

[49] *Ibid.*, 161. Amongst other critics, Lotte W. Forest also accepts Walzel's three types of leitmotif, but objects to the limitation of these to *only* the calling-card type in Ludwig's works: "Von diesen drei Arten, sagt Walzel, verwende Ludwig nur die erste, die 'Visitenkarte', und zwar ebenso wie Dickens, mit leicht humoristischem Anstrich" (p. 5). Walzel does not, however, limit Ludwig's leitmotifs in all his works to only the first type. Although he gives no example from *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, he points to the playing of the Valtinessin with her hood in *Die Heiteretei* as a leitmotif of the second type and asserts that this is "sicherlich nicht bloss eine immer wieder abgegebene Visitenkarte" (*Gehalt und Gestalt*, 360), although he does not say what further function and significance the leitmotif has. – In *Between Real and Ideal*, W. H. McClain also states during his discussion of *Die Heiteretei*: "Of these three types Walzel finds, surprisingly enough, only 'visiting-cards' in Ludwig's stories" (p. 49). Both Forest and McClain appear to have overlooked the "bisher" in Walzel's following remark: "Innerhalb der ganzen Gruppe von Wiederholungen, die an Dickens' und Otto Ludwigs Erzählungen bisher zu betrachten waren, handelt es sich nur um Merkworte physiognomischen oder mimischen Inhalts [i.e., of Walzel's first type of leitmotif]" (*Das Wortkunstwerk*, 167). For further examples of leitmotifs from *Die Heiteretei* which Walzel does not classify under his first type, see *Das Wortkunstwerk*, 168-169.

[50] The true significance of this central leitmotif has constantly been overlooked. In his otherwise perceptive essay, "Otto Ludwig und Charles Dickens", *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXXIV (1910) 15-45, Heinrich Lohre writes: "Einzelheiten der Charakteristik mögen immerhin auch hier an Dickens erinnern: Fritz Nettenmair erhält seine stereotype Geste, eine rasche Bewegung auf dem Hacken, welche besagt: 'Ich bin ein Kerl, der das Leben kennt, und die Art, die lange Haare trägt' " (p. 40). Is

Indeed, this is true of most of the leitmotifs in the novel which are in some way or other artistic devices to reveal the central motif of the work, as we have already seen, for example, in regard to the leitmotif *Zusammenleben* and those used in reference to Herr Nettenmair.

There are several leitmotifs used of Fritz. The most important, without their frequent variations, are the following: "Ich bin einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt";[51] "Träumer";[52] "ehrlich";[53] "zu verzeihen haben";[54] "So weit haben sie ihn doch noch nicht gebracht";[55] "bedeutend";[56] "ledern";[57] "Das Knarren seiner wohlgewichsten Stiefel sagte . . .: 'Ei, da ist er ja! da ist er ja!' . . . 'Nun wird's famos!' "[58] At first these leitmotifs appear to be merely Fritz's boasts about himself, his comments on events and other characters, or the narrator's description of Fritz. The leitmotifs, however, are used ironically. They contradict the true nature of the situation or of the event in which

---

this, however, merely a stereotype gesture? Is it really repeated continually in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* without changes in its form and significance? Lohre does not perceive the variations which the leitmotif undergoes, nor its actual function which makes it more than a characteristic gesture. – In his Stanford dissertation, "Elements of Musicality in the Literary and Critical Works of Otto Ludwig" (1933), Gerrit de Jong, Jr. includes Fritz's central leitmotif in Walzel's first category and gives a mere paraphrase of it, not an analysis of its significance: "Fritz constantly prides himself on knowing life. He feels that he knows how to handle 'the kind that wears long hair and aprons.' And whenever he gives utterance to his self-confidence, he puts his hands in his trouser pockets and jingles the money in them. He also has a characteristic turn which has the ability to express in a single gesture the fact that Fritz is different from other people, since he knows the world" (p. 185). According to this, then, the leitmotif would mean simply what it says: Fritz is self-confident and knows women and the world. If this is correct, however, if the leitmotif is merely a stereotype gesture or calling-card expressing Fritz's arrogance, then why, for example, the variation of the leitmotif by the narrator as "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" (p. 65)?

[51] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, e.g., 16, 20, 38-39, 39, 53, 65, 69, 74, 75, 103, 133, 146, 152, 174.

[52] *Ibid.*, e.g., 23, 38, 42, 49, 52, 74, 75, 125, 133, 140, 145, 146.

[53] *Ibid.*, e.g., 20, 94, 105, 132, 133, 171, 218.

[54] *Ibid.*, e.g., 52, 57, 77, 125, 126, 151, 252.

[55] *Ibid.*, e.g., 174, 180, 247.

[56] *Ibid.*, e.g., 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, 61, 71, 84, 90, 133, 137.

[57] *Ibid.*, e.g., 53, 54, 85, 87, 253.

[58] *Ibid.*, e.g., 50, 125, 151, 160, 209, 253.

Fritz is involved[59] and thus reveal his misunderstanding of the situation or event, *his interpretation of it from a purely subjective point of view.*

The first leitmotif listed above is one of the most effective. The ironical significance it acquires is also emphasized by the variations it undergoes in its form. When Apollonius tells Fritz of his love for Christiane, Fritz offers to help his, at this stage, shy brother by speaking to her on his behalf, for, he adds, "ich weiss mit den Mädels umzugehen".[60] This is an expression of Fritz's opinion of himself as superior to Apollonius, as better able to cope with the matters of life than his brother whom he regards as a "dreamer". The reference to Apollonius as a dreamer is another of the leitmotifs in the novel. Its use tells us more about Fritz than Apollonius and it is employed frequently in connection with the other leitmotif being examined here, so we shall consider them together.

Later, Fritz tells his brother that he is having no success in interesting Christiane in him. He expresses his sympathy for Apollonius and suggests he should go away for a while. This, Fritz maintains, may induce Christiane to look more favorably on him, for it would be evidence that he is suffering from his love for her. Fritz urges his brother to do as he advises, " 'Glaub' mir, ich kenne, was lange Haare trägt und weiss damit umzugehen.' "[61] Once more Fritz is boasting of his superiority over Apollonius, his ability to cope with the matters of life better than his brother, the dreamer.

There has been so far no important variation in the leitmotif.

---

[59] Thus, Wilhelm Emrich's observation concerning Thomas Mann's leitmotifs may be made also of Ludwig's, as our examination will show. Emrich writes in *Protest und Verheissung* (Frankfurt a. M. and Bonn, 1960): "Sie [the leitmotifs] werden durchgehend ironisch formuliert, d.h. sie enthalten bereits ihren Widerspruch, ja ihre Negation in sich selbst" (pp. 114-115). – Ludwig's employment of the leitmotifs contradicts Elisabeth Witte's statement in her Göttingen dissertation, "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst" (1958): "In der Form [of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] herrscht wie im inhaltlichen Geschehen ein Prinzip der Unwiederholbarkeit, ..." (p. 31). The very essence of the leitmotif is recurrence and repetition. The analysis of the function of the leitmotifs here will also serve to refute Witte's remark by showing the effects achieved by their recurrence.

[60] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 16.

[61] *Ibid.*, 20.

Instead of "Mädels", we now read "was lange Haare trägt". However, while Fritz is waiting for Apollonius to return from Cologne, he quietens his fears about his brother by referring to him once more as the dreamer and making a gesture which indicates "wie besser er sich auf das Leben verstehe und auf die Art, 'die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt'."[62] The addition to the leitmotif here clearly reveals that Fritz increasingly considers himself superior to his brother in all matters of life, not just as far as the female sex is concerned. This is confirmed once more when Fritz repeats his gesture which is intended to signify "ich bin ein Kerl, der das Leben versteht".[63]

When Apollonius arrives home, Fritz admits that he is no longer a dreamer.[64] However, at the ball, where Fritz is once more convinced of his own superiority, where his vanity is flattered by the guests who are drinking his champagne, Apollonius seems to him to be once again the awkward dreamer whom he used to compel to dance for his, Fritz's, own amusement. Fritz, therefore, introduces his brother to a girl and forces him to dance with her. When he sees that Apollonius dances well and must admit he is no longer a dreamer, Fritz is not disturbed but commences dancing himself, sure that he will triumph over his brother in this way.

> Aber der Undankbare [Apollonius]! Er liess sich nicht überglänzen. Fritz Nettenmair tanzte jovial und wie einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt; der Bruder war ein steifes Bild dagegen. Der nickte den Takt nicht mit dem Kopfe, der warf nicht, trat der linke Fuss im Niedertakte auf, den Oberleib auf die rechte Seite und umgekehrt; der fuhr nicht mit kühner Genialität hin und wieder quer über den Tanzsaal und stach andere Paare aus; der tanzte durchaus weder jovial, noch wie einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare und Schürzen trägt; und dennoch blieben alle Blicke auf ihm haften; und Fritz Nettenmair übertraf vergeblich sich selbst.[65]

Ludwig is here not commenting from his objective point of view as omniscient narrator. He is portraying the incident as Fritz sees it. The reference to Apollonius as "ein steifes Bild" makes this clear, for the general reaction of the people at the ball contradicts this description of Apollonius' dancing. "Apollonius wurde nur immer mehr bewundert und geehrt . . ." [66] is the narrator's objective comment. The leitmotif, which is used here in its fullest form, reveals Fritz's imprisonment within his own subjectivity which sees the people and events at the ball *only as he wishes them to be, not as they are,* for Fritz is the only person who thinks that Apollonius does not and that he himself does dance "wie einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt". The continuing recurrence of the leitmotif shows how this *idée fixe* dominates Fritz's mind and prevents him from obtaining an objective and true picture of reality. Fritz can also not accept the fact that Apollonius has changed. Sometimes he condescendingly admits that his brother is no longer a dreamer, but only when this admission does not disturb his own picture of himself as superior to Apollonius.

---

[62] *Ibid.*, 38-39.
[63] *Ibid.*, 39.
[64] *Ibid.*, 49.
[65] *Ibid.*, 53.

The two leitmotifs are repeated and coupled on several further occasions throughout *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.* As has been noted before, the narrator varies Fritz's own favorite boast of "Ich bin einer, der die Welt besser kennt, als der Träumer" to "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" This comment expressly reveals that Fritz does not know the world as he claims, but merely his own ego. The irony present in the leitmotif is here most evident.

The last two occasions on which the first leitmotif occurs are also especially significant. "Wie er [Fritz] schnell darüber hindenkt, findet er für Alles Rath, und was ihm heute nicht einfällt, das wird ihm morgen einfallen; morgen ist auch ein Tag. Und er ist einer, der –. Die Wendung, mit der er in seinen Weg einschwenkt, gelingt ihm so jovial, als je." [67] "Er [Fritz] bewacht ihr [Christiane] jeden Tritt, sie kann nichts thun, was er nicht erfährt. Und lässt sie es ihn [Apollonius] durch einen Dritten wissen, so wird er es ihm ansehen. O Fritz Nettenmair ist einer, der –!" [68] This abbreviation of the leitmotif gives it the effect of an oft repeated and worn phrase produced by Fritz on every occasion he needs to boost his ego. The omission of the significant part of the leitmotif, i.e., that Fritz knows the world, appears ironic and suggests that this is not true, that Fritz is laboring under an illusion.

---

[66] *Ibid.*, 54.

[67] *Ibid.*, 152.

[68] *Ibid.*, 174.

Ehrlich is the third of the leitmotifs which reveal Fritz's inability to obtain an objective and stable understanding of those about him. At first Fritz says of Apollonius that he is too honest. [69] Later he maintains: "Ich bin zu ehrlich mit solch einem falschen Spieler [Apollonius]." [70] In a moment of insight, Fritz perceives of his wife: ". . . es [Christianes Antlitz] war zu ehrlich, um etwas zu verschweigen." [71] Later, however, when he ascribes to Christiane his own unscrupulousness, we read of Fritz's thoughts: "Sie [Christiane] dachte nicht, dass es [Ännchen] sterben würde; und wie es doch starb, wälzte sie die Schuld von sich auf ihn [Fritz]. Und er war wieder der dumme Ehrliche gewesen; . . ." [72] Fritz thus blames the other characters for his own unscrupulous actions. The leitmotif, *zu verzeihen haben,* which expresses his delusion that Apollonius and the others have done him wrongs which he is forced to pardon, as well as the leitmotif, *So weit haben sie ihn doch noch nicht gebracht*, are also symptomatic of this. Fritz becomes so locked in self and so divorced from reality that he actually believes the others are forcing him to kill Apollonius. When he first torments Christiane with the threat to harm his brother, we read of his thoughts: "Es ist nur einer von Fritz Nettenmair's neumodischen Spässen. So weit haben sie ihn doch noch nicht gebracht, im Ernst an solche Dinge zu denken. Aber wenn sie Apollonius davon sagt, dann muss er [Fritz] es, und sie trägt die Schuld." [73] On another occasion, Fritz is disturbed while attempting to damage Apollonius' ropes [74] and, in his anxiety, runs away. After the danger has passed, he considers whether he should return, but rejects this idea. "Er sagte sich: 'so weit sollen sie ihn nicht bringen.' " [75] Fritz thus places the blame for his own murderous plans on Apollonius and Christiane. Finally, when Fritz attacks his brother on the steeple of St. Georg, Apollonius refuses to jump of his own accord and Fritz rushes at him saying: " 'Auch das willst du auf mich wälzen! Auch dazu willst du mich bringen! Nun ist's mit deiner Scheinheiligkeit am End.' " [76] At this stage Fritz has lost all contact with the world outside of him and is so completely isolated in self that he has become insane. The use of the leitmotif here strikingly reveals this fact.

---

[69] *Ibid.*, 20.

[70] *Ibid.*, 94.

[71] *Ibid.*, 105.

[72] *Ibid.*, 171.

[73] *Ibid.*, 174.

[74] In his essay, "A Note on Fritz Nettenmair", *Monatshefte*, 1939, 349-352, Stuart Pratt Atkins points out the fact that Fritz is not described as actually cutting Apollonius' ropes here as has been falsely assumed by several critics.

[75] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 180.

The remainder of the leitmotifs associated with Fritz make their first appearance during the description of the ball and the preparations for it. Especially noticeable are *bedeutend* and *ledern*. The happenings at the ball are firstly described by the narrator from Fritz's point of view.

> Keine Hand wurde so oft und anhaltend geschüttelt, als des jovialen Fritz Nettenmair's, keinem Gesellschaftsmitgliede so viel ungeheucheltes Lob in die Ohren gegossen, als ihm. Aber wie liebenswürdig war er auch! Wie herablassend nahm er alle die verdienten Huldigungen auf. Wie witzig zeigte er sich; wie gefällig lachte er. Und nicht allein über seine eigenen Spässe – denn das war keine Kunst; sie waren so geistreich, dass er lachen musste, wenn er nicht wollte – auch über andere, so wenig die es, gegen die seinen gehalten, verdienten. Es gab freilich auch Leute, die sich wenig an ihn kehrten, aber er bemerkte sie nicht, und die es deutlicher zeigten, waren "Philister, Alltagskerle, unbedeutende Menschen", wie er dem Bruder mit verächtlichem Bedauern in das Ohr sagte.[77]

In this whole passage, the narrator ironically presents the events and the people as Fritz sees them. The portrayal of Fritz himself is not objective description by the omniscient author, but Fritz as he pictures himself in the role of a sophisticated and witty raconteur. This becomes evident from the ironic tone of the passage and also when we consider the sentence immediately following. It is not written from Fritz's point of view, but is a comment of the narrator: "Es war ganz eigen; man konnte an dem Grad ihrer [der Ballgäste] Verehrung von Fritz Nettenmair ihre grössere oder geringere Bedeutung als Menschen und Bürger ganz genau ermessen." [78] The comment here reveals that the "important" people are simply those who flatter Fritz. Christiane eventually perceives this and finds them most unimportant.[79] Later in the ball description, it also becomes evident that the respect shown Fritz by the "important" people is not as candid as he believes. When the narrator refers to them here he often adds a phrase which explains why they flatter Fritz, namely because of thirst for his champagne.[80] The description of the ball and the leitmotif *bedeutend* thus show Fritz to be caught within a purely subjective and, therefore, false interpretation of people and events.

---

[76] *Ibid.*, 247.

[77] *Ibid.*, 50-51.

[78] *Ibid.*, 51.

The leitmotif *ledern* is also introduced during the episode of the ball in a passage which once more presents Fritz's point of view. "Es war der ledernste Ball, den Fritz Nettenmair mitgemacht; er konnte nicht lederner sein, war Fritz Nettenmair daheim geblieben." [81] The reason for Fritz's sudden loss of interest in the ball, to which he had so greatly looked forward, is that he feels himself outshone by his brother: "Aber Apollonius wurde nur immer mehr bewundert und geehrt und der Ball demzufolge nur immer noch lederner." [82] *Ledern* is thus, like *bedeutend*, not an objective and true evaluation of the ball, but merely Fritz's subjective picture of it.

When Fritz is preparing for the ball, he loses himself in his imaginings of how he will be the center of all eyes: "Das Knarren seiner wohlgewichsten Stiefel sagte einstweilen, ehe es die Ballgäste thaten: 'Ei, da ist er ja! da ist er ja!' und wenn er dazwischen mit beiden Händen in den Hosentaschen mit Geld klapperte, klang es aus allen Saalecken: 'Nun wird's famos! Nun wird's famos!' " [83] This leitmotif also appears whenever Fritz believes he is triumphing over his "enemies". Thus, when he has a vision of a funeral, which he interprets as Apollonius' funeral, he is so exultant he can even shed tears for his brother: "Er [Fritz] weinte um ihn [Apollonius]; denn durch die Pausen des Grabgesangs klang leise ein lustiger Schottischer, den die Zukunft aufstrich: 'Da kommt er ja! Nun wird's famos!' " [84] A further example occurs in Fritz's dream after the incident with Christiane which caused Ännchen's death. In his dream Fritz believes that Apollonius is dead: "Fritz Nettenmair weiss es im Halbschlaf: in der Stube liegt ein Todter. Sie haben ihn gebracht. 'In das Unabänderliche muss der Mensch sich ergeben.' Zum erstenmal seit vielen Monden schläft er wieder ruhig. Und warum sollte er nicht? Aus dem leisen Weinen wird ein lustiger schottischer Walzer. 'Da ist er ja! Nun wird's famos!' klingt es aus der Ferne vom rothen Adler herein in seinen Schlaf." [85]

---

[79] *Ibid.*, 84.
[80] *Ibid.*, 53-54.
[81] *Ibid.*, 53.
[82] *Ibid.*, 54.
[83] *Ibid.*, 50.
[84] *Ibid.*, 151.

Fritz, however, proves to be incorrect in his opinion of himself as the main attraction of the ball. Apollonius is the center of all eyes.[86] Fritz is also mistaken in his unconscious perceptions of the future. Ludwig emphasizes both these facts in the description of Fritz's own funeral by repeating and varying the two leitmotifs *ledern* and *Da ist er ja! Nun wird's famos!*: "Der Zug ging am rothen Adler vorbei. Es war schon wieder ein Ball da oben, bei dem Fritz Nettenmair fehlte; gewiss ein lederner Ball! Da ist er ja! da ist er ja! klang dem Zuge entgegen und begleitete ihn unermüdlich die ganze Strasse entlang. Aber famos konnte es nicht werden trotzdem." [87] We see here, once more, the true significance of *ledern*. It says nothing objectively about the quality of the ball, but merely indicates that every ball at which Fritz does not shine or which he does not attend is, in Fritz's eyes, *ledern*. The negation of the second leitmotif in "Aber famos konnte es nicht werden trotzdem" emphasizes that Fritz's triumph in his vision was a false one, that reality has turned out to be the opposite of what he desired. The vision of a funeral was a partly false perception of a future event because Fritz saw the event only as he himself wanted it to happen. The vision of a funeral procession immediately became Apollonius' funeral procession for Fritz because the wish which dominated his conscious and unconscious mind was the wish for Apollonius' death. The vision was a projection of Fritz's inner desire: "Es war ein Bild dessen, was in Fritz Nettenmair's Seele vorging, ein so ähnlich Bild, dass er nicht wusste, sah er aus sich heraus oder in sich hinein." [88]

---

[85] *Ibid.*, 160.

[86] *Ibid.*, 53.

[87] *Ibid.*, 253.

[88] *Ibid.*, 150. In discussing leitmotifs of Walzel's second and third types, de Jong perceives that the repetition of *Da ist er ja! Da ist er ja!*, as Fritz's funeral passes by the inn which he used to frequent, has more than calling-

In his dream Fritz knew that a death had taken place. It became for him once more Apollonius' death. Fritz's obsession with the idea was even greater at this stage. The noise of the door, which penetrated his dream and which was connected with his daughter's death, immediately signified for Fritz the thud of Apollonius' falling body. It is Fritz, however, who will fall to his death, not Apollonius. Fritz's vision and dream are, thus, not objective and true, but subjective and, therefore, partly false perceptions of future occurrences.

The subconscious was, before Ludwig, often employed in literature to foreshadow correctly future events,[89] but even Fritz's subconscious mind is unable to go beyond a subjective and false perception of reality. Within the world of the novel, *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, the close correspondence between the dream, the vision, and the actual events suggests a correct perception of a future occurrence is possible if this perception is not distorted by the subjective wish of the perceiver; or, stating the problem perhaps more accurately in another way: the discrepancies between the dream, the vision, and the actual events are caused by the distortion of reality through the subjective wish of the perceiver. Apollonius' second dream also illustrates this point. This dream, like Fritz's vision and dream, is a partly false perception of a future occurrence because Apollonius sees the event, his brother's fall from the steeple, as his own fears would have it happen, not as it actually does happen. In his dream he pushes Fritz to his death in order to retain Christiane, whereas in the actual event Fritz tries to murder Apollonius and is responsible for his own death. Apollonius' dream version of the incident is the unconscious expression of what is dominating his mind: his fear to what extreme his, for him illicit, love may lead. The perception of a future event is thus once

---

card significance. Typical of the critics who have discussed the leitmotifs, however, de Jong does not say what this significance is but merely remarks that the leitmotif "exercises an awful force" and: "The application of the identical expression under such totally different circumstances at once establishes a significant comparison between the past and the present and never fails to work strongly on our emotions. Certain ideas the author wants to communicate are brought home to us with much greater force than if they were expressed in words" (p. 196).

[89] E.g., Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson*, I, vii; V, i. Also the dream of the blue flower in Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*.

more distorted by the subjective wish or rather, in Apollonius' case, the subjective fear of the perceiver. This is basically also the explanation of Fritz's misinterpretations of the incidents actually happening to and about him. The distortion of reality through the subjective wish of the perceiver is the reason, for example, why Apollonius seems "ein steifes Bild" to Fritz, whereas Fritz, in his own eyes, dances "wie einer, der die Welt kennt und mit der Art umzugehen weiss, die lange Haare hat und Schürzen trägt". The leitmotifs used of Fritz, his vision and his dream thus fulfill the function of revealing his inability to transcend the confines of his narrow subjectivity, his isolation in self.[90]

This fact may be further illustrated by contrasting *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* with certain features of Romantic works. A most important distinction between the function of the leitmotifs in Ludwig's novel and the function of the symbols in the works of the Romantics is that Ludwig's leitmotifs reveal the limitation of the individual to his own subjectivity, the impossibility of a transcendence. They reject all connections between the individual and anything beyond him. The symbols in the works of the Romantics have mostly the very opposite function. They reveal the connection between the finite and the infinite, the interrelation of all things, e.g., Novalis' symbol of the blue flower in *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*.[91]

---

[90] In *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss* (Berlin, 1960), Josef Kunz has the following to say about *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*: "Auch die vielgerühmte künstlerische Sorgfalt und Ökonomie im Aufbau dieser Novelle kann über die grundlegenden Schwächen nicht hinwegtäuschen. So liegt über allem die lastende Atmosphäre der Unfreiheit und des Zwangs, eine solche, die nirgends den Blick ins Freie und Offene gestattet. Von der Thematik her gesehen, geht es um das Problem einer schwierigen, seelischen Verfassung. Aber nicht die Thematik als solche ist es, die das künstlerische Gelingen gefährdet, es ist vielmehr wie bei Heyse dieses, dass es nicht gelungen ist, das Sonderbar-Ausnahmehafte in bezug zu übergreifenden Normen zu bringen. In diesem Sinn sind alle Gestalten der Novelle, nicht nur Apollonius, sondern auch sein Bruder Fritz, der Vater und auch die anderen auf ihr seelisches Schicksal gnadenlos festgelegt, und die pedantisch durchgeführten Leitmotive, die den einzelnen Personen in stereotyper Weise beigegeben sind, machen den seelischen Zwang noch lastender und trostloser" (II, 1872-73). Kunz demands features from Ludwig's work which have nothing to do with its nature. He judges it from the point of view of the aesthetics of German Classicism in demanding that Ludwig show a relationship to "übergreifende Normen". This is completely to misunderstand the novel, for one of the problems here is that there are no longer any such norms. That the leitmotifs "machen den seelischen Zwang noch lastender und trostloser" is far from being an artistic failing, but is rather a proper consequence of their function of revealing certain characters' isolation in self. The burdensome atmosphere, which Kunz finds so objectionable, is also a natural consequence of the alienation of the three main characters and their misunderstanding of the others, as also Gustav Freytag and Fritz Lüder failed to see (cf. Lüder, 136). Some of Richard Brinkmann's comments serve to support our argument here (*Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 152-153).

Dreams also have a different function in the works of the Romantics from that which they fulfil in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. The dreams in Ludwig's novel,[92] like the leitmotifs, reveal the inability of the individual to go beyond the confines of his own subjectivity, to transcend a subjective and false understanding of the world in which he lives, his inability to escape his isolation in self. Dreams, as well as all spheres of the subconscious and unconscious, were, however, for the Romantics the domain of the "Weltseele" and "die eine allgemeine Offenbarung des ewig schaffenden göttlichen Geistes" (Carl Gustav Carus).[93] E. Th. A. Hoffmann writes in the foreword to *Die Elixiere des Teufels* that it seems to him: ". . . als könne das, was wir insgemein Traum und Einbildung nennen, wohl die symbolische Erkenntnis des geheimen Fadens sein, der sich durch unser Leben zieht, es festknüpfend in allen seinen Bedingungen." [94] Fritz, however, receives no such insight in his dream.[95]

IV

During the course of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Fritz's isolation increases to such a degree that he loses all contact with the world outside him and becomes insane. He falls prey to the danger which his father narrowly escaped. Ludwig wrote of Herr Nettenmair: "Es war ein Zustand, der in völligen Wahnsinn übergehen musste, wenn nicht die Aussenwelt eine Brücke zu ihm schlug und ihn mit Gewalt aus seiner Vereinzelung heraus riss." [96] There are several indications throughout the novel that Fritz will end in insanity, in complete isolation in self. His moments of insight, of escape from his subjective and false experience of reality become less frequent as the novel unfolds. Before he attacks Christiane at Ännchen's bedside, we read of Fritz's misinterpretation of all events and actions in order to find evidence that his wife and brother are deceiving him as he deceived them, to find confirmation of his unconscious assumption that they are not different from himself, that they are just as unscrupulous as he is. "Wäre sein Auge nicht selber so krank, dass es ihm aussen nur immer das Eine zeigt, über dem seine Seele innen unablässig brütet, er müsste es am Gesichte der Mutter sehen, an dem Ton ihrer Stimme hören, sie verstellt sich nicht, das Kind ist wirklich krank und sehr krank; aber ihre Weichheit, ihre Angst ist ihm nur die Angst ihres Gewissens, die Angst vor seiner Strafe, die sie verdient fühlt und doch entwaffnen will." [97] Fritz's moment of insight after Ännchen's death

---

[91] Cf. Novalis, *Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1960), I, 195-197.

[92] Cf., apart from Fritz's dream, Apollonius' second dream.

[93] Quoted in Paul Kluckhohn, *Das Ideengut der Deutschen Romantik* (Tübingen, 1961), 39.

[94] (München, 1961), 8.

[95] In his book, *Otto Ludwig, ses théories et ses œuvres romanesques* (Paris, 1920), Gaston Raphaël fails to perceive the special function which the dreams and the vision have in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. He regards their function as the same as that of the dreams and visions in Ludwig's earlier prose works, namely the correct foreseeing of future occurrences as they will actually happen. Raphaël is unaware of the significance of Fritz's and Apollonius' partly correct perceptions of future events and also sees no difference between the

---

function of the dreams and the vision in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and those in the works of the Romantics: "A coté de tous ces souvenirs, voici encore quelques survivances d'habitudes anciennes d'Otto Ludwig. Les rêves qui se réalisent, la seconde vue . . . ne sont-ce pas des restes de romantisme?" (p. 440). The same objection may be made to Fritz Lüder's discussion of the dreams (p. 133) as to Raphaël's. In his Bonn dissertation, "Die Raumgestaltung in Friedrich von Hardenbergs *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* und Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*" (1955), Helmut Griessmann fails to see the special nature of the dreams in Ludwig's novel, although he is specifically dealing also with *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. Griessmann does not perceive the motif of isolation in self expressed by the dreams and disregards as unimportant their *partial* perception of future events. He sees their only function as being the creation of tension in the reader for what will come: ". . . reale Begebenheiten werden mit ganz unscheinbarer Überspitzung und geringfügiger Veränderung [!] in den Traum hineingenommen. . . . Sie [the dreams] weisen alle vor auf die Kampfszene der beiden Brüder auf dem Turm und spannen so den Leser, welchem durch die innere Verschiedenartigkeit der Träumenden durchaus nicht klar ist, wie die bevorstehenden Ereignisse ausgehen werden" (p. 206).

[96] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 189.

[97] *Ibid.*, 157.

is fleeting. He is unable to escape from his *idée fixe* that Apollonius and Christiane will deceive him. Ludwig comments: "Zu tief hat er die Geleise des alten Wahngedankens eingedrückt, um ihn für immer verwischen, zu weit ist er gegangen auf dem gefährlichen Weg, um noch umkehren zu können. Die Klarheit des Blitzes müsste schwinden und der alte Wahn hüllte die Dinge wieder in seine verstellenden Nebel." [98]

Fritz's approaching insanity is symptomatic of his increasing isolation in self, his loss of contact with reality. The climax in his psychological development comes, as was remarked before, in section seventeen where he falls a helpless prey to his *idée fixe* imagining that Apollonius has intentionally robbed him of his wife's and his children's love.[99] Fritz's subsequent attack on his brother is the consequence of this insanity: his absolute inability to transcend a subjective and false experience of reality, his complete and radical isolation in self.[100]

3. APOLLONIUS NETTENMAIR

I

The analysis of section six has already revealed that Apollonius, like his father and Fritz, is caught in a subjective and false interpretation of reality. Further proof of this is to be found when we read of the father and Apollonius: "Die beiden so nah verwandten Menschen verstanden sich nicht. Apollonius setzte die innerliche Natur seines eigenen Ehrgefühles bei dem Vater voraus und der Alte sah in der

---

[98] *Ibid.*, 167-168.

[99] *Ibid.*, 239-240.

[100] It is here interesting to note the difference between Fritz's insanity and that which was to overcome Heinrich in Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. Insanity, for Novalis, meant the transcendence of the narrow confines of self, signified the attainment of a higher and fuller existence. According to Novalis' plan for the continuation of his novel, Heinrich was, after voluntarily becoming insane, to be transformed into inorganic and organic forms of nature. In this state of insanity, moreover, he was to perceive the meaning of the world: "Heinrich wird im Wahnsinn Stein – klingender Baum – goldner Widder – Heinrich errät den Sinn der Welt – Sein freiwilliger Wahnsinn" (*Schriften*, I, 344). Of Fritz Nettenmair, however, we read that he cannot know the world, only himself: "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!' (p. 65).

Weigerung des Sohnes und dessen Beweis, er könne der schwierigen Lage des Hauses gerecht werden, nur den alten Trotz auf seiner Unentbehrlichkeit, der es nun nicht einmal mehr der Mühe werth hielt, zu verbergen: der Vater war in seinen Augen nichts mehr, als ein hülfloser alter blinder Mann." [101] Each misunderstands the other because he assumes the other is the same as himself. Apollonius presumes that his father possesses the same particular sense of honor which he himelf does and that his father will, therefore, understand the reason for his actions. Herr Nettenmair presupposes in Apollonius his own picture of himself as a helpless, blind, old man and interprets his son's actions in the false light of this supposition.

Apollonius is also isolated in the sense that, although he lives among other people, he has none but a superficial contact with them and none but a superficial understanding of them. He is actually alone. When he is first introduced to the reader, Apollonius is an old man. He is greatly respected by the townspeople, but has no close, friendly relations with any of them. They greet him and he returns their greetings, but they both remain at a respectful distance.[102] We are told also of Apollonius' "nach Aussen abgeschlossenes Dasein" [103] and "schweigsame Geschlossenheit".[104] The leitmotif *Zusammenleben* occurs three times in reference to his life with Christiane and her children. They live in the same house but see each other rarely. Their life together is characterized by reserve ("Zurück-haltung").[105] There is no joy and outward expression of love. Their behavior to one another is correct in every detail, but it is too formal and lacking in warmth. This is why their life "together" seems strange and unusual. The narrator expresses this three times by the leitmotif, as if he too is puzzled by this way of living "together". "Es ist ein eigenes Zusammenleben in dem Hause mit den grünen Fensterladen." [106] "Damals schon begann das eigene Zusammenleben." [107] In the last section of the novel, which returns to Apollonius' life described in the first section, the leitmotif occurs once more. The sentence which immediately follows it is most revealing. "Und nun begann das eigene Zusammenleben der beiden Menschen. Sie sahen sich wenig." [108] Apollonius' and Christiane's life "together" is thus actually a life apart. This is why it is "eigen".[109]

---

[101] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 299.
[102] *Ibid.*, 5-6.
[103] *Ibid.*, 5.
[104] *Ibid.*, 6.
[105] *Ibid.*, 6.
[106] *Ibid.*, 6, 7.
[107] *Ibid.*, 7.

II

Apollonius is the one member of the Nettenmair family who is aware almost from the beginning of the isolation prevalent there. He perceives this when he compares his own family, i.e., his father, his brother, and himself, with the Cousin's family in Cologne.[110] However, Apollonius does not realize that this isolation is the main cause of the misunderstanding in his family and he makes no successful efforts to overcome it, although he has on three occasions the opportunity to escape self in the fulfilment of his love for Christiane. Apollonius is prevented from achieving this by traits in his character.

His shyness and naïvety prevent him from claiming Christiane's love when she first acknowledges her love in return. The inability to perceive the extremely unscrupulous nature of his brother leads him to accept Fritz as an intermediary and to believe his reports of Christiane's unwillingness to have anything to do with him. Apollonius attributes to Fritz his own extremely honest and over-scrupulous nature. He is unable to think otherwise of his brother, as was shown in the examination of section six.[111] This inability to perceive the reality of the situation thus prevents Apollonius from obtaining Christiane's love at the beginning.

---

[108] *Ibid.*, 303.

[109] De Jong's failure to recognize the function and significance of the leitmotifs is most evident in his reference to the leitmotif *Zusammenleben*. "One of the most striking and convincing examples of the use of Leitmotiv in the works of Otto Ludwig is another found in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It is a series of seventeen references to 'das eigene Zusammenleben in dem Hause mit den grünen Fensterladen', which reoccur with such regularity that we are here forcefully reminded of the 'tectonic' technique of Emile Zola. As in some of the works of the latter, this Leitmotiv appears at the beginnings and ends of definite parts of the entire story, thereby emphasizing them and helping to render more obvious the inner unity of the work" (pp. 201-202). Upon reading this we reexamined the novel to see where the seventeen occurrences of the leitmotif *Zusammenleben* were to be found. They were, however, to be found nowhere, but the explanation of de Jong's seventeen examples was evident later in his dissertation. He was not at all concerned with the centrally important leitmotif *Zusammenleben* and its connections with the motif of isolation (indeed, he did not perceive these), but only with the comparatively insignificant repetition of "das Haus mit den grünen Fensterladen". It must also be noted that the simple repetition of a leitmotif does not necessarily have importance for the structure of the work. It must be shown how, not just stated that, the recurrence of a leitmotif helps "to render more obvious the inner unity of the work".

[110] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 24.

Throughout *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Ludwig emphasizes Apollonius' strong sense of honor and duty. When Apollonius learns of the poor financial state of his family due to Fritz's squandering of money, he swears to provide for his father, Christiane, and her children and to protect them from all dishonor. His promise takes possession of his whole being and gives meaning to his endeavors.[112] When Christiane tells Apollonius of her love after he returns from Brambach, where she believed he had fallen to his death, he is at first confused and asks himself whether he has any right to it now. At this stage, he is aware of Fritz's deception. More powerful than his love for Christiane, however, is his sense of honor and Apollonius says to himself in regard to his desire to claim Christiane: "das Wort, das du gegeben hast, ist, die Ehre des Hauses aufrecht zu erhalten, und was du thun willst, muss sie zernichten." [113] For this reason, he rejects Christiane's love.

When Fritz dies, Apollonius has his third opportunity to claim Christiane's love in a marriage with her. Nobody opposes this marriage. Herr Nettenmair insists on it, Christiane is willing, and the neighbors and the towns-people expect it.[114] Why then does Apollonius not marry Christiane? Why is there such a conflict within him? The answer is that a marriage with her would not conform with his pedantic and exaggerated scrupulousness. "Er [Apollonius] musste sich sagen, dass er dachte wie sie, und dass seine Wünsche keine unerlaubten mehr waren. Aber dass sie es einmal gewesen, warf seinen Schatten herüber auf das vorwurfsfreie Jetzt. Seine Liebe, ihr Besitz, schien ihm wie beschmutzt."[115] The third trait in Apollonius' character which prevents him from accepting Christiane's love and marrying her is, then, his tendency to take certain virtues to extremes, his over-scrupulousness. This is a prominent feature of his character and Ludwig prepares us well for it. The Cousin emphasizes its importance for understanding Apollonius and also points out that it may have unwelcome consequences.[116] Elsewhere we read of Apollonius' "Folgerichtigkeit bis zum Eigensinn"[117] and "natürliche, ängstliche Genauigkeit".[118] Ludwig also seriously tells us of Apollonius' need for inner and outer cleanliness.[119] When he feels that something is not as it should be in himself or in the members of his family, Apollonius brushes their clothes as though to remove thereby the stain within. This is the leitmotif employed to reveal his over-scrupulousness. In his first dream, Apollonius senses that all is not right in his family. He feels himself involved in this and we read: "Dann fand er sich wieder auf dem Fahrstuhl hoch am Thurmdach. Da war Alles anders, als es sein sollte, die Schiefer in verkehrter Richtung gedeckt, und nun stack er in die Ausfahrtthür eingeklemmt, ringsum in staubige Spinnengewebe eingewickelt; er hatte seine Festtagskleider an; sie waren voll Schmutz; er wischte und bürstete, dass er schwitzte, und sie wurden nicht rein."[120] Fritz mocks Apollonius' extreme scrupulousness calling him "Federchensucher".[121] It is this characteristic he hates most in his brother. When Fritz attacks Apollonius on the steeple of St. Georg, he says to him: " 'Auf deinem Gewissen sollst du mich haben, du Federchensucher!' "[122] Apollonius' over-scrupulousness is also reflected in the extreme tidiness of his garden[123] and the pedantic neatness of his letters: "Wie abgezirkelt stand die Anrede in jedem genau auf derselben Stelle; genau um eben soviel Zoll und Linien darunter der Beginn des Briefes. Der Abstand der schnurgeraden Zeilen von einander und vom Rande des Bogens war in allen der gleiche; nichts war ausgestrichen; keine kleinste Unregelmässigkeit verrieth die Stimmung des Schreibers oder eine Veränderung derselben; ein Buchstabe genau wie der andere." [124]

---

[111] *Ibid.*, 95, 99.
[112] *Ibid.*, 169.
[113] *Ibid.*, 228.
[114] *Ibid.*, 255.

---

[115] *Ibid.*, 267.
[116] *Ibid.*, 25.
[117] *Ibid.*, 76.
[118] *Ibid.*, 245.
[119] *Ibid.*, 272.
[120] *Ibid.*, 55-56.
[121] *Ibid.*, e.g., 15, 65, 89, 94, 106, 107, 132, 135, 247.
[122] *Ibid.*, 247.
[123] *Ibid.*, 3-4.

Ludwig tells us of differences between Apollonius and Fritz, but one of these, the former's over-scrupulousness and the latter's unscrupulousness, conceals at bottom a feature which they have in common. Richard Brinkmann perceived this and formulated the problem very well when he wrote: "Beide [Apollonius and Fritz] werden sie in der Befangenheit ihres allzu tugendhaften oder lasterhaften Sinnes der 'Welt, wie sie ist' nicht 'gerecht'; beide verstellen sie sich die Wirklichkeit, wie sie tatsächlich ist, immer wieder durch ihr eigensinniges Wesen." [125] Both Fritz and Apollonius distort reality by interpreting events and people in the light of their own exaggerated characteristics and are thus caught within a subjective and false experience of reality.[126] Apollonius, with his extreme, hypochondriac scrupulousness, rejects the possibility of a marriage to Christiane because he considers it would be a guilty act: "Was Verstand und Liebe sagen mochten, er fühlte in der Heirath eine Schuld." [127] His brooding about Fritz's death has brought him to the conclusion that he, Apollonius himself, was responsible for it. We read of his thoughts:

> Die bösen Gedanken machten ihn [Apollonius himself] unfähig, den Bruder zu retten. Der Sturz des Bruders machte dessen Weib frei. Er wusste das, als er den Bruder stürzen liess. Desshalb ja hatte er ihn im Traume gestürzt. Nun war es ja, wie in dem schlimmen Traum, der Bruder war todt, und er hatte sein Weib. Nimmt er des Bruders Weib, die frei wurde durch den Sturz, so hat er ihn hinabgestürzt. Hat er den Lohn der That, so hat er auch die That. Nimmt er sie, wird das Gefühl

---

[124] *Ibid.*, 119.

[125] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 210.

[126] In her Columbia dissertation, "The Theme of Courtship and Marriage in the Prose Works of Three Poetic Realists: Ludwig, Gotthelf, Keller" (1962), I. H. Washington notes the part played by Apollonius' "over-developed conscience" in his refusal to marry Christiane, but she believes that he is thus acting from a clear grasp of the situation (pp. 56-59). Washington ignores Brinkmann's study, fails to perceive Apollonius' misunderstanding of reality, indeed the whole significance of the motif of isolation, and draws a parallel between *all* of Ludwig's prose works and Novalis' idea of the individual nurtured by "Gemeinschaft" (pp. 118, 4).

[127] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 267.

> ihn nicht lassen; er wird unglücklich sein, und sie mit unglücklich machen. Um ihret- und seinetwillen muss er sie lassen. Und will er das, dann erkennt er, wie haltlos diese Schlüsse sind vor den klaren Augen des Geistes, und will er wiederum das Glück ergreifen, so schwebt das dunkle Schuldgefühl von Neuem wie ein eisiger Reif über seiner Blume, und der Geist vermag nichts gegen seine vernichtende Gewalt.[128]

Apollonius, however, allowed Fritz to fall to his death and saved himself not because he thought he would be able to possess Christiane, but because of the selfless oath he had sworn to protect her, his father, and her children. The actual incident is described as follows: "Da sieht er [Apollonius] im Geiste den alten, braven, stolzen Vater, sie und die Kinder; ihm kommt das Wort, das er sich gab; er ist der einzige Halt der Seinen; er muss leben. Ein Schwung, und er hat den Balken im Arme; in demselben Augenblicke stürzt der Bruder vorbei." [129] Apollonius' subsequent brooding on this event, his later examination of it through the magnifying glass of his own over-scrupulousness, distorts and falsifies the actual incident.

Apollonius further blames himself for not having found a way to prevent his brother's death and for thinking of Christiane while he was working on the steeple of St. Georg.[130] Fritz's attack on Apollonius was, however, too swift and unexpected for the latter to have saved him. Apollonius showed remarkable presence of mind in saving himself. It is only his extreme scrupulousness which finds guilt in his actions by once more distorting the reality of the situation when he subsequently broods upon it.

Even when Apollonius was working on the steeple of St. George before Fritz's attack, he felt that he was preparing the way for some catastrophe by his "guilty" thoughts concerning Christiane.[131] Because of his absorption in these thoughts, Apollonius omits to place one of the slates in position. It is this mistake which keeps him on the steeple until Fritz arrives. Apollonius' subsequent interpretation of this fact to make himself responsible for his brother's action and death is, to say the least, also over-scrupulous and symptomatic of a hypochondriac way of thinking. He blames himself for his brother's death because he unknowingly provided Fritz with an opportunity to commit murder.[132]

---

[128] *Ibid.*, 271.

[129] *Ibid.*, 248.

[130] *Ibid.*, 266-267.

[131] *Ibid.*, 244-245.

Thus, Apollonius' sense of guilt at a possible marriage with Christiane and his sense of guilt at not having saved Fritz arise from his over-scrupulous nature. His over-scrupulousness distorts reality for him.[133]

III

The mistake in his work which Apollonius ascribes to his "guilty" thoughts about Christiane and which he regards as preparing the way for a catastrophe, namely Fritz's death, later on serves to prevent a much greater disaster. When the lightning strikes the steeple of St. Georg, the fire is prevented from spreading immediately only because of Apollonius' mistake.

---

[132] *Ibid.*, 266-267.

[133] In his essay, "Zum Aufbau von Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXIV (1942), 343-356, Hermann Böschenstein fails to perceive that there is a distinction between the "Gelübde" which Apollonius makes and "das Wort" which he gives himself. The "Gelübde" is the vow to serve his hometown and "das Wort" the pledge to take care of his father, Christiane and her children. (Hermann J. Weigand also draws attention to Böschenstein's confusion in his essay, "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXVIII, 1946, 391-393.) The consequence of Böschenstein's inaccurate reading of the text is that he sees an extreme emphasis placed on Apollonius' wish to serve his community and therefore interprets his decision not to marry Christiane in the light of this false fact. Böschenstein writes: "Was es mit der immer und immer wieder betonten Erfüllung auf sich hat, macht der Ausgang der Geschichte klar; Apollonius ist in der Sturmnacht zum öffentlichen Manne aufgerückt, in den Dienst der Gemeinschaft getreten und dieser sozusagen auf Lebenszeit verpflichtet worden. Das ist der Sinn der Verwandlung, die mit stürmischen Vorzeichen eingeleitet und dann Schritt für Schritt zum Abschluss gebracht wird" (pp. 344-345). "Die Entsagung mag hart erscheinen, wenn man an Christiane denkt, es liegt Grösse und Notwendigkeit darin, wenn wir das Lebensideal verstehen und billigen, das Apollonius beispielhaft vorzuleben hat" (p. 356). This interpretation, based on a misreading of the text to begin with, leaves out of consideration the part Apollonius' over-scrupulousness plays in his rejection of Christiane's love. This is also not seen as symptomatic of his isolation in self, indeed the motif of isolation is not at all perceived. – Later in his essay, Böschenstein extends his above interpretation to give yet another reason why Apollonius cannot marry Christiane. This is, as surprising as it may seem, that Apollonius is not an ordinary "realistic" character, but a symbolical one. "Apollonius hat einst einer beseligenden Liebe entsagen müssen und ist dann – aber man darf nicht sagen, darum – zum Manne eines hohen, sittlich-sozialen Zieles gewachsen. Jetzt, wo es ihm nach anfänglicher Verhinderung

> Ja, etwas, was ihm [Apollonius] die dunkle Furcht durch Sorge erhöht hatte, erwies sich nun sogar als heilvoll und glücklich. Er erkannte, nur das Wasser, welches die Lücke wochenlang geschluckt, und das nun im Holze gefroren, liess die Flamme nicht so schnell überhand nehmen, als ohne dies Hinderniss geschehen wäre. Der Raum, den der Brand bis jetzt einnahm, war ein kleiner. Der Frost in der Verschalung warf die hartnäckig immer wiederkehrenden hüpfenden Flämmchen lange zurück, ehe sie bleibend einwurzeln und von dem Wurzelpunkte aus weiter fressen konnten. Hatten sie sich einmal zu einer grossen Flamme vereinigt und diese den durch Frost gefeiten Raum unter der Lücke überschritten, dann musste der Brand bald riesig über die Thurmspitze hinauswachsen, und die Kirche und vielleicht die Stadt erlag der vereinten Gewalt von Feuer und Sturm.[134]

---

möglich wäre, seinen Willen in die Tat umzusetzen, tritt die einst aufgegebene Liebe wieder vor ihn, und sein Gefühl ist so warm wie ehedem. Was soll er tun? Ein realistischer Erzähler würde die Wahl nicht schwierig finden: lass den Apollonius heiraten und dann seinen öffentlichen Dienst antreten! Ludwig schafft aber, mindestens in der Erfüllungshandlung, auch symbolische Dichtung, und hier lässt sich das Glück der bürgerlichen Lebensform nicht mit dem Drang zum Gemeinschaftsdienst verbinden. Apollonius ist, auf dieser Seite der Geschehnisse, eine typische, sogar eine symbolische Gestalt, die das Ideal des sozialen Menschen rein verkörpern muss, durch keine alltäglich-familiären Beimischungen getrübt. Wer ihn mit Christiane verheiraten will, muss dann auch mit Du Bois-Reymond glauben, Faust hätte Gretchen zu seiner Frau machen und die Elektrisiermaschine erfinden sollen" (p. 353). Böschenstein here takes his misinterpretation to extremes. Why must Apollonius "das Ideal des sozialen Menschen rein verkörpern"? How is this necessary for the unity of the novel as a whole or for the development of Apollonius' character? Even if it were true that Apollonius is completely absorbed in duty to the community, how does this make him a symbolic character? – Böschenstein's essay, according to its title, purports to be concerned with the structure of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. His failure to differentiate between "Gelübde" and "Wort" causes him to regard the action of the novel as Apollonius' struggle to fulfil his vow to his native town (pp. 345-346). The struggle in which Apollonius is involved, however, is an inner one: the attempt to understand the human beings about him, to achieve contact with them and thereby to escape isolation in self, as the above analysis has shown and will further show. – Böschenstein (p. 350), however, as opposed to Weigand (p. 395), does perceive that Apollonius' guilt in reference to Fritz's death is unfounded. To insist on Apollonius guilt is to ignore the actual description of his brother's death and to blame one person for unknowingly providing another with an opportunity to kill him.

[134] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 286.

Apollonius does not perceive in the favorable consequence of his mistake a refutation of his falsely imagined guilt. He does seem to regard this as a good omen, but only in the light of his decision not to marry Christiane which he made *before* he went up onto the steeple of St. Georg during the storm. This is an important point which must be established so that the analysis may proceed.

When the storm becomes dangerous Herr Nettenmair sends Apollonius in his stead to "die Rats- und Bezirks-Gewitternachtwachen" in the townhall.[135] Apollonius fears what may happen if the lightning strikes the steeple of St. Georg and he has to extinguish a possible fire there. Since his brother's death Apollonius has been a prey to dizzy spells, a manifestation of his feeling of guilt, whenever he has attempted to ascend the steeple. Suddenly shouts are heard exclaiming that the lightning has struck St. Georg. The description of Apollonius' reaction to this is most important.

> Der Bauherr sah Apollonius erbleichen, seine Gestalt noch tiefer in sich zusammensinken, als seither. "Wo ist der Nettenmair?" rief es wieder draussen. Da schlug eine dunkle Röthe über seine bleichen Wangen und seine schlanke Gestalt richtete sich hoch auf. Er knöpfte sich rasch ein, zog den Riemen seiner Mütze fest unter dem Kinn. "Bleib'ich", sagte er zu dem Bauherrn, indem er sich zum Gehen wandte, "so denkt an meinen Vater, an meines Bruders Weib und seine Kinder." Der Bauherr war betroffen. . . . Eine Ahnung kam dem Freunde, hier sei Etwas, was mit dem Seelenleiden Apollonius' zusammenhänge. Aber der Ausdruck seines Gesichtes hatte nichts mehr von dem Leiden, er war weder ängstlich, noch wild. Durch Sorge und Schrecken hindurch fühlte der wackere Mann etwas wie freudige Hoffnung. Es war der alte Apollonius wieder, der vor ihm stand. Das war ganz die ruhige, bescheidene Entschlossenheit wieder, die ihn beim ersten Anblick dem jungen Manne gewonnen hatte.[136]

This passage tells us that something significant has just taken place in Apollonius. He has regained his inner stability. It is indeed here that he has made his decision. That it is not merely the decision to face the dangers of the storm is indicated by the Builder's perception "hier sei Etwas, was mit dem Seelenleiden Apollonius' zusammenhänge", and the cause of Apollonius' inner disturbance and suffering was the problem whether to marry Christiane or not. That the decision, which caused him so much difficulty, is merely the decision to ascend the steeple of St. Georg is further out of the question, since Apollonius, with his extreme sense of duty and honor, could not do otherwise if his hometown were threatened.

---

[135] *Ibid.*, 275.

[136] *Ibid.*, 277-278.

We are next told that Apollonius sets out for St. Georg and that, on his way, he considers how to combat the possible dangers of the situation. The reality of the situation drives away his previous exaggerated fears of what could happen. Ludwig then expressly tells us that Apollonius has made a decision and that this is the source of his regained confidence. "Er wusste, ohne besonders daran zu denken, er hatte den rettenden Entschluss gefunden, und dieser war die Quelle seines erneuten Daseins. Es wusste, er wird nicht schwindeln, und blieb er doch, so fiel er seiner Pflicht zum Opfer und keiner Schuld, und Gott und die Dankbarkeit der Stadt traten statt seiner in das Gelübde für die Seinen ein." [137] The guilt referred to here is that in regard to a marriage with Christiane. This is the phantom which has been haunting him, as was shown earlier in this chapter, since Fritz's death. Apollonius has now given up his desire and all intention to marry Christiane and knows, therefore, that whatever happens on the steeple of St. Georg will not be on account of this supposed guilt. Retrospectively, the narrator tells us later of the solution of the conflict within Apollonius and explicitly states that his decision was the decision not to marry Christiane. "Einige Tage nach der Nacht musste sich Apollonius zu Bette legen. Ein heftiges Fieber hatte ihn ergriffen. Der Arzt erklärte die Krankheit erst für eine sehr bedenkliche, aber in ihr kämpfte nur der Körper den Kampf gegen das allgemeine Leiden sieghaft aus, das geistig in dem Entschlusse jener Nacht seinen rettenden Abschluss gefunden." [138] "Der alte Herr gerieth in Zorn, als Apollonius ihm seinen Entschluss, nicht zu heirathen, mittheilte. . . . Er [Apollonius] wusste, nur seinem Entschlusse treu, blieb er der Mann, sein Wort zu halten." [139] Apollonius is not described as going up onto the steeple of St. Georg to fight the fire until a few pages after we have been told of his decision and his regained confidence.[140]

---

[137] *Ibid.*, 279.

[138] *Ibid.*, 301.

[139] *Ibid.*, 298-299.

[140] *Ibid.*, 282. Lutz Besch, because of an inexact reading of the text, believes

It is extremely important for an understanding of Apollonius' character and, indeed, of the end of the novel that the consequences of his decision not to marry Christiane be fully realized. As was pointed out before, Richard Brinkmann believes that because Apollonius is forced to act by the necessity of the situation during the storm, because reality takes hold of him there and compels him to do something, he obtains

---

that Apollonius regains his inner balance by his daring actions *during* the storm on the steeple of St. Georg. "In der vom Dichter grossartig gestalteten Gewitternacht erlangt er [Apollonius] *unter Einsatz seines Lebens* sein inneres Gleichgewicht zurück" (p. 23). Similarly, H. E. Loesing writes in "Der Aufbau der Novellen Otto Ludwigs", diss. Bonn (1953): "In der Nacht vor der angesetzten Verlobung entfacht ein furchtbares Unwetter durch Einschlag eines Blitzes einen Brand im Kirchturm. Es gelingt Apollonius, diesen in höchster Selbstaufopferung zu löschen, ohne vom Schwindel erfasst zu werden und abzustürzen. *Diese Tat bringt ihn zu der Klarheit*, dass er Christiane nicht heiraten kann, denn erst in der Entsagung vermag er seinen inneren Frieden wiederzufinden" (pp. 73-74). As we have shown, Apollonius regains his inner balance and solves the conflict within himself by his decision not to marry Christiane. This decision is, moreover, made before Apollonius risks his life during the storm, indeed even before he is described as ascending the steeple of St. Georg. The success of Apollonius' actions during the storm prove that his regained inner balance and confidence are lasting, are not momentary things. Ludwig writes of him in a dangerous moment on St. Georg: "Jetzt musste sich sein neugewonnener Lebensmuth bewähren und er that's" (p. 287). Thus Apollonius does not regain his inner balance and confidence by his deeds during the storm, he merely proves that these qualities, which he regained beforehand by his decision not to marry, are lasting. – As Fritz's attack on Apollonius shows us the consequence of his insanity, described in the section preceding the attack, so Apollonius' proving of his regained confidence and of his freedom from feelings of guilt by his daring actions during the storm shows us the consequence of his decision beforehand not to marry Christiane. On both occasions the description of an inner development in a character is followed by the portrayal of an event in which the character's actions illustrate the consequence of his inner development. This is one of Ludwig's main narrative methods. – (In his essay, "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", which was not available to me in Germany when this chapter was written, H. J. Weigand reaches the same conclusions as to when Apollonius makes his decision and as to the nature of this decision. The present investigation of the matter was prompted by Besch's and Loesing's above statements. Weigand, however, fails to see these problems in relation to the motif of isolation. The remainder of the dicussion here will concern itself with this. I have also let the detailed explanation of the moment of Apollonius' decision stand in the hope that it will not be ignored in future as, for example, Loesing ignored Weigand's important findings).

a clear picture of reality, a correct understanding of the events and of the people with whom he is involved.[141]

It is true that, faced with a dangerous task and forced to act, Apollonius does escape from the crippling influence of his brooding thoughts. When he goes up onto the steeple of St. Georg in the storm he becomes aware of the difference between what he imagined would take place there and what actually does happen. "Wie anders war es nun in der Wirklichkeit gekommen, als die fieberischen Ahnungen gedroht!"[142] The reality of the situation, then, proves Apollonius' fears to be false phantoms of his hypochondriac imagination and Brinkmann is, therefore, correct here in regard to Apollonius when he writes: "Wo sie [the characters] je in einen echten Kontakt mit der Wirklichkeit kommen, wo sie einen Augenblick vielleicht die wahre Realität erkennen, da ist es in jenen exzeptionellen Situationen, in denen die Wirklichkeit selbst sie kräftig anpackt und ihr Handeln entschieden bestimmt."[143] Apollonius' perception here, however, is a slight one and one which does not have to do with the main point: that the storm forces him to make his decision. This decision is not merely the decision to go up onto the steeple, as may appear from Brinkman's insufficiently commentated and incomplete quotation of the passage from *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It is the decision not to marry Christiane, as has already been shown. The important fact in judging whether Apollonius comes into contact with reality, whether he truly perceives what is real, is not that the necessity of the actual situation forces him to make *a* decision. What is important is the *nature* of the decision he is compelled to make. Apollonius' decision is not to marry Christiane and this means that he has not escaped from his illusion of guilt. The sickly, brooding thoughts are overcome by the necessity to act only insofar as these thoughts refer to what may happen on the steeple of St. Georg. As far as they refer to the deeper and more serious problem of Apollonius' sense of guilt at a marriage with Christiane, they are not overcome. These thoughts disappear, it is true, but only because Apollonius gives up the struggle to rid himself of his sense of guilt by his decision not to marry Christiane. This is the important decision that Apollonius is compelled to make and this means, contrary to Brinkmann's opinion, that he misses reality, that he remains caught in his subjective and false interpretation of it, that he remains isolated in self. It is, indeed, the function of the final part of the novel to demonstrate this fact.

---

[141] Brinkmann writes: "Weder der Verstand noch das vom Verstande verwirrte Gefühl scheinen fähig die Wirklichkeit zu legitimieren. Das 'Schicksal' erst löst Apollonius in seiner Entscheidung ab: Bei der Brandkatastrophe findet er zu dem, was er tun soll. Ein starkes Ereignis mit einem eindeutigen Hinweis auf das Gebot, die Not zu wenden, eine Notwendigkeit im eigentlichen Sinne erlöst Apollonius von dem Bann seiner eigenen Gedanken: 'Vor der wirklichen Not und ihren Anforderungen traten die Gebilde seines Brütens wie verschwimmende Schatten zurück. . . . Mit Gedanken kann man Gedanken widerlegen, gegen Gefühle sind sie eine schwache Waffe. Vergebens sah sein Geist den rettenden Weg; er war in der allgemeinen Erschlaffung mit erkrankt. Jetzt war ein stärkeres gesundes Gefühl gegen die starken kranken Gefühle aufgeglüht und hatte sie in seiner Flamme verzehrt. Er wusste, ohne besonders daran zu denken, er hatte den rettenden Entschluss gefunden. . . .' [*Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Merker III, 168ff.] Wie Apollonius und Fritz so leben auch die anderen Menschen alle in der Erzählung in der Befangenheit, in der oft dumpfen Befangenheit ihrer eigenen Vorstellungen, die sie sich von der Wirklichkeit machen, in denen sie aber doch eigentlich nur sich selbst kennen und nicht die Welt. Wo sie je in einen echten Kontakt mit der Wirklichkeit kommen, wo sie einen Augenblick die wahre Realität erkennen, da ist es in jenen exzeptionellen Situationen, in denen die Wirklichkeit selbst sie kräftig anpackt und ihr Handeln entschieden bestimmt" (*Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 212). - (Whether Brinkmann is correct when he states above that *all* the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* know only themselves and not the "world", is a question which will be considered in the next chapter.)

[142] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 288.

[143] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 212.

The decision not to marry Christiane saves Apollonius, however, because it is the only decision which is true to his own nature. He accepts his separation from her because a marriage would not be compatible with his character. Ludwig comments towards the end of the novel: "Der alter Bauherr, der bis zu seinem Tod mit ganzer Seele an ihm [Apollonius] hing, blieb sein einziger Umgang, wie er der Einzige war, dem sich Apollonius, ohne seiner Natur ungetreu werden zu müssen, enger anschliessen konnte." [144]

IV

Zwischen Himmel und Erde cannot end other than with Apollonius' decision not to marry Christiane and with the acceptance of his isolation. Any other conclusion to the novel would contradict Apollonius' character as it was presented throughout. Paul Heyse was one of the first to perceive this. He wrote to Ludwig: "Ein Gefühl, das unsern Frauen bei aller herrlichen Grösse des Werkes, die sie nicht genug anstaunen konnten, zu schaffen machte – und wahrscheinlich teilen sie es mit den meisten ihres Geschlechts – hatte mich nicht von fern angewandelt. Dass der Held [Apollonius] Ihrer Geschichte sein Geschick zu erfüllen hat und eine absolute menschliche ideale Entwicklung des Verhältnisses über die Grenzen seiner Natur hinausgegangen sein würde, war mir ausser Zweifel." [145] Julian Schmidt, on the other hand, emphasized "das Unbefriedigende des Ausgangs der Erzählung, da 'die Form der Entsagung gegen alle Analogien der menschlichen Natur verstösst' ".[146] It was also dissatisfaction with Apollonius' decision and with the conclusion of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* which caused Arthur Kracke to write: "Wenn die Geschichte mit dem selbstverschuldeten Tod des Betrügers das erwartete Ende fände, so wäre sie wohl künstlerisch geschlossener. . . ." [147] Schmidt fails to see that Apollonius' renunciation of Christiane is completely in keeping with his character and that a marriage to her would have contradicted his nature as portrayed throughout the novel. Kracke's suggestion of a possible alternate end would hardly be an artistically successful solution to the work since it would leave the problem of Apollonius' and Christiane's relationship after Fritz's death completely unsolved. It would, moreover, necessitate severe changes in the mode of narration. The first section describing Apollonius' life after his decision not to marry Christiane would have to be omitted since his decision and his way of life here would be completely unmotivated. This would have as further consequence that the incidents of the novel could no longer be told retrospectively.[148]

---

[144] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 301.

Ludwig himself very ably defended the end of *Zwischen Himmel*

---

[145] *Ludwigs Werke*, ed. Arthur Eloesser (Berlin, 1908), II, 8.

[146] Merker, III, xii.

[147] "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* als Otto Ludwigs ureigenstes Werk", *Otto-Ludwig-Kalender* (1942), pp. 28-29.

[148] Lutz Besch explicitly undertakes to defend the artistic structure of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* against Kracke's objection ("Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", 19). Besch is, however, sometimes overzealous in his defence and thereby reveals some of the

und Erde. In the outline of a letter, presumably to Eduard Devrient,[149] he wrote:

> Zuletzt musste Apollonius der lieben Sentimentalität wegen aus seinem Charakter fallen, der beschränkte Hypochonder musste zu einem absolut menschlich sittlichen Ideal werden. Der Alte dazu. Die Leute heirateten sich. Apollonius bekam auch keinen Rückfall in seine Hypochondrie, sondern die Ehe war die glücklichste, der Alte selbst – die andere Seite des Hypochonderschicksals, nämlich die sich ergibt, wenn die Hypochondrie gar kein Gegenwicht mehr in äusserer Thätigkeit findet – wurde noch eine gemütliche Seele und schaukelte in Gemütlichkeit zerfliessend die junge Hypochondristenbrut. Recht; die Weiber unter Damen und Herrn wären befriedigt gewesen, aber – nun ja, ich selbst hätte mich geschämt in tiefster Seele: ... Wozu dann all die Züge der Ängstlichkeit

---

weak points in the novel. Besch writes: "Die Reparatur des Kirchendaches beginnt im 4. Kapitel und endet im 18. Kapitel. Dieser Teil der Dichtung umfasst die Entwicklung, die Ludwig darzustellen beabsichtigte, nämlich das Aufeinandertreffen 'beider Enden der Menschheit'. Er stellt also den Kern der Novelle dar. Diese Auffassung wird durch die Verwendung eines Motivs unterstrichen, dass allerdings wenig glücklich gewählt erscheint. Die Kapitel 3 und 19 begrenzen den Hauptteil; nur in diesen beiden tritt der Geist des Hauses auf und ringt die bleichen Hände. Das erstemal ahnt er das kommende Unheil voraus. 'Und der Geist wandelte noch lange..., her und hin..., und rang die bleichen Hände, er wusste warum.' Das zweitemal ist der Hauptkonflikt zwar gelöst, doch Apollonius ist gemütskrank. Der Geist erscheint vor seinem Stübchen, 'die bleichen Hände wie flehend gegen den Himmel emporhebend' " (p. 21). – The spirit by no means fulfils the artistic function of framing the central part of the novel. At the most it serves to exaggerate the tension and the pathos of the situations where it appears. Both times the spirit is worried about what is to come. If it served to frame the central part of the work, its second appearance should not have to do with a future event, but should mark the conclusion of what has just occurred. Also, how do the two appearances of the spirit refute Kracke's claim that *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* should end with the death of Fritz? That the spirit appears for the second time *after* Fritz's death, assuming that it *must* appear at all, is no reason why the novel cannot end with Fritz's death. Witte makes similar objections to Besch's remarks ("Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", 29-30, Note 2).

[149] This is Paul Merker's supposition: "Noch eingehender ... spricht sich Ludwig über die Tendenz seiner Dichtung in einem, freilich in nur sehr fragmentarischem Zustand erhaltenen Briefkonzept aus (vgl. Goethe- und Schillerarchiv, VII, 7). Weder der Empfänger noch die Zeit dieses im Original nicht nachweisbaren Briefes ist dabei erwähnt. Doch scheint es, besonders im Hinblick auf den Anfangspassus, so gut wie sicher, dass als Adressat Eduard Devrient in Frage kommt, der sich, wie andere Briefurteile zu erkennen geben, über die in Apollonius verkörperte Grundidee absprechend geäussert hatte. Dies scheint der Anlass für Ludwig gewesen zu sein, seine Gedanken ausführlicher zu Papier zu bringen" (Merker, III, xv-xvi).

> und Hypochondrie in Apollonius, wenn das Resultat herauskommen sollte, er sei kein Hypochonder.[150]
>
> Apollonius handelt als Hypochonder, was er einmal von Natur ist und wozu ihn die Situationen, in die er gerät, immer mehr machen müssen, zuletzt nur [lädierte Stelle] er wählt die Diät, bei der er sich am wohlsten finden wird. Wenn er, um den gerechten Anforderungen des Weibes zu genügen, ihr [und] sein Glück den Buchstaben der Pflicht opferte, dann wär' er ein Tugendheld.[151]
>
> Nein, lieber Freund, Sie haben das Buch nicht selbst gelesen, sonst würden Sie gefunden ha[ben, dass] sein Tun, sein Entschluss, den Sie eine Entsagung nennen, völlig in Harmonie mit jenen Zügen steht, [und er?] auch in diesem Entschlusse der naive Federchenblaser ist und keineswegs ein gespreizter Tugendheld. Und wozu alle jene Züge, wenn als Endresultat herauskommen soll, er sei kein Hypochonder?[152]

Apollonius, then, relinquishes his claim to Christiane's love and remains alone because his nature will not allow him to act otherwise. At the very beginning and end of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, he is shown in this isolated state. By the first section and the last section, by this frame of the novel depicting Apollonius when he is old and alone, Ludwig emphasizes the inevitable fact that he will end isolated in self.[153] His isolation is not as unrelieved as that of his father and of Fritz. He is able to open his heart to the Builder and tell of the conflict which had been raging within him and, as long as the Builder lives, he treats Apollonius as his son.[154] This relationship is by no means given as much emphasis as those in which Apollonius has no contact with other people, but its existence does provide him with more relief than his brother, who ends in insanity, in complete and radical isolation in self, and his father, who almost shares Fritz's fate, are able to obtain.

---

[150] Merker, III, xvi.

[151] Merker, III, xvii.

[152] Merker, III, xviii.

[153] Hebbel also appears not to have perceived the function and significance of the beginning and end of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. In his essay, "Über Anfang und Schluss von Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Euphorion*, XXIV (1922), Karl Reuschel, suggesting possible sources for the garden and the final passage, notes: "Ein Urteil Hebbels über *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* erwähnt Emil Kuh in einem Brief an Hebbel vom Oktober 1857 (*Hebbel-Kalender* 1905, S. 157): die Erzählung 'würde vollendet sein, wenn Anfang und Schluss nicht wären' . . ." (p. 884).

[154] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 301. Cf., also p. 127, p. 81.

V

Apollonius is, however, not only isolated from other people. Like his father, he finishes his life in his garden, but, again like his father, without any contact with nature. Apollonius is not such a tyrant as Herr Nettenmair, but nevertheless his attitude to nature as shown by the way he tends the garden is the same as his father's. Ludwig refers to the garden as Apollonius' own creation.[155] It reflects his exaggerated cleanliness and anxious, pedantic correctness in its extreme tidiness, which makes it look as though it has not been merely swept, but scrubbed clean; in the pedantic straightness of the flower-beds, which seem to have been laid out with the help of geometrical instruments; and in the exact shapes of the trees, which look as though they are trimmed every day by the town's most careful barber.[156] All this suggests no loving care of, no surrender to, no communion with nature. but a desire to order and control, to impress one's own personality on it. Apollonius and his father treat nature as a dead object which they mould as they see fit. It is a plaything of their wills. Ludwig explicitly points this out in regard to Herr Nettenmair. When he is no longer able to tyrannize his family, he becomes a tyrant in his garden. "Im Gärtchen fand er Beschäftigung; er konnte sich neue machen, wenn ihm nicht genügte, was die Plege des Gärtchens bis jetzt seinen Besorgern von selbst abgefordert. Er konnte das Alte entfernen, Neues ersinnen und wieder Neuerem Platz machen lassen, und er that es. Unumschränkt herrschend in dem kleinen grünen Reiche, in dem von nun an kein Warum mehr laut werden durfte, wo neben dem Gesetze der Natur nur noch ein einziges waltete, sein Wille, vergass oder schien er zu vergessen, dass er früher einen mächtigeren Zepter geführt." [157]

The failure of critics to perceive the motif of isolation from nature in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* seems in part due to reading this work together with Ludwig's remarks about nature in his personal documents and the works preceding his last novel.[158] Thus Karl Holl refers to Ludwig's love of gardens in relation to the description of Apollonius in his garden and quotes the following passage from a letter of Ludwig which is meant, by Holl, to throw light on the significance of the garden in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*: "Ich habe mich so hineingelebt, dass er [the garden] ein Teil von mir ist. . . . Ich höre ihn rauschen, meine ganze Kindheit, das einzig Schöne im Leben und was sonst mein Gemüt betroffen, alles bezieht sich auf ihn. Er ist meine ganze Seelengeschichte. Nur in ihm lebe ich ein ganzes Leben. Überall ausser ihm bin ich fremd und ungern. O, Garten! Garten! unter den ärmlichsten Bedingungen ein Einsiedler in dir!"[159] The communion with nature rhapsodized in Ludwig's letter is nowhere to be found in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. A further indication of this is that Herr Nettenmair withdraws from his garden to his room. He has found no solace in the garden. Nettenmair is, like Ludwig, a hermit in his garden, but the statement "überall ausser ihm bin ich fremd und ungern" cannot be made by Nettenmair, otherwise there would have been no need for him to withdraw from it. Apollonius and his father, in further contrast to Ludwig, seem indeed unaware that nature has anything to offer man. For them it is simply an object which they form as they see fit.[160]

---

[155] *Ibid.*, 4.

[156] *Ibid.*, 3-4.

[157] *Ibid.*, 29.

[158] The hero of *Maria* has, for example, a completely different attitude to nature from that of Herr Nettenmair and Apollonius. He comments: "Jedem andern ist die Natur ein Ding, eine Sache für den Nutzen oder für das Ver-

---

gnügen; dem Germanen ist sie eine Person, die mit ihm empfindet wie er mit ihr . . . wer sich der Natur nicht verschliesst, dem verschliesst sich auch die Natur nicht" (Merker, I, 212).

[159] Karl Holl, "Otto Ludwig Probleme, I", *GRM*, VI (1914), 19.

[160] For these reasons we cannot agree with Heinz Loevenich's comment on *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in his essay, "Zur Bedeutung des Raumes in Erzählungen", *Der Deutschunterricht*, XV (1963): "Garten und Glück gehören zusammen. Das Gärtchen der Nettenmairs in seiner eingeengten Lage ist der Spiegel des kleinen, bürgerlichen Glücks" (p. 105). The main characters concern themselves resignedly with the garden only when they have been unable to achieve real happiness elsewhere. Apollonius and his father are, moreover, not described as living happy, idyllic lives with nature as represented by the garden. – The motif of isolation also contradicts Karl Reuschel's interpretation of Apollonius in the garden as "Gottesdienst in der Natur" (pp. 880-881, cf. note 153 above).

CHAPTER VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TITLE

The title of Otto Ludwig's *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* occurs, unlike most titles, many times as an image throughout the text of the novel.[1] Most critics who have written on the occurrences of the title refer to it as a "symbol" or, at least, as an attempt at a "symbol".[2] By this designation, they set the title apart from the many other recurring phrases in the novel which they regard as leitmotifs. In the present discussion of the title, this tradition of Ludwig-criticism will be followed, for, unlike such recurring phrases as Fritz's "Ich bin einer, der die Welt kennt . . .", the title is not associated mainly with one character, is an image and, whether successful or not, its constant repetition obviously aims at establishing not merely a gradually ironic significance, but a much more complex set of associations than is attempted in the employment of any other recurrent phrase. In its occurrences in the work, the title is evidently intended to be a "complex symbol". By symbol we mean, as Austin Warren has expressed it, "something standing for, representing, something else" and further: "In literary theory, it seems desirable that the word should be used in this sense: as an object which refers to another object but which demands attention also in its own right as a presentation." With the title of Ludwig's novel, we are, of course, not actually dealing with an "object" but an image. Warren also succinctly answers this question when he writes: "An 'image' may be invoked once as a metaphor, but if it persistently recurs, both as presentation and representation, it becomes a symbol. . . ." [3]

---

[1] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, e.g., 66, 67, 68, 70, 93, 100, 178, 195, 200, 204, 222, 252, 264, 291, 306.

[2] The most important and characteristic interpretations are contained in: Alexander R. Hohlfeld, "The Life of Otto Ludwig", *The German Classics of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Kuno Francke (New York, 1914), IX, 268-279. Arthur Kracke, "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* als Otto Ludwigs

Several critics have broached the problem as to whether this image is a symbol or not. No critic has, however, considered all the passages where the title is present in order to discover what symbolic significance or significances it may have on each occasion. Certain obvious attempts at symbolic use of the title have thus been entirely disregarded. The relationship between the various occurrences of the title and their function in the artistic structure of the novel have also not been shown.[4] The present interpretation will attempt to remedy this situa-

---

ureigenstes Werk", *OLK* (1942), 15-33. Lutz Besch, "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *GRM*, XXXI (1943), 19-30. Helmut Griessmann, "Die Raumgestaltung in Friedrich von Hardenbergs *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* und Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", diss. Bonn (1955). Richard Brinkmann, *Wirklichkeit und Illusion* (Tübingen, 1957). Fritz Lockemann, *Gestalt und Wandlungen der deutschen Novelle* (Munich, 1957). Elisabeth Witte, "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", diss. Göttingen (1958). Konrad Nussbächer, Epilogue to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Stuttgart, 1960), 260-264. William H. McClain, *Between Real and Ideal. The Course of Otto Ludwig's Development as a Narrative Writer* (Chapel Hill, 1963).

[3] *Theory of Literature*, 177-178.

[4] Lockemann (p. 153) and Nussbächer (p. 264) discuss no specific occurrence and assign no particular significance to the title, although they regard it as a symbol. Nussbächer, for example, writes: "Als Werk eines Dichters erweist sich die Erzählung vor allem in den grossen Szenen auf dem Turmdach. Sie tragen deutlich visionären Charakter. Hier hat die Sprache Ludwigs den grossen Atem, den ehernen Klang, die elementare Wucht, die ihr sonst meist versagt bleiben. Hier wird auch der Titel des Werks über die reale Situation des Schieferdeckers hinaus zum grossen, gültigen Symbol für die des Menschen überhaupt: 'Zwischen Himmel und Erde' " (p. 264). This is typical of many brief mentions of the title in Ludwig-criticism, e.g., Fritz Lüder, *Die epischen Werke Otto Ludwigs und ihr Verhältnis zu Charles Dickens* (Leipzig, 1910), 159. Karl Reuschel, "Über Anfang und Schluss von Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Euphorion*, XXIV (1922), 880. H. Loevenich, "Zur Bedeutung des Raumes in Erzählungen", *Der Deutschunterricht*, XV (1963), 104-105. Alexander Hohlfeld offers an interpretation of the title which removes it from the novel and sees it in relation to Ludwig's aesthetic theories expressed elsewhere: "It [*Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] is a story of slaters working on steep roofs and tall church spires; and as does their scaffolding, so the poet tries to move along 'between heaven and earth,' his feet and eyes firmly fastened to life's realities, his heart and soul lifted into the realm of the ideal, the eternal. Thus interpreted, the title of the story may indeed be taken as a symbol of that principle of 'poetic realism' which Ludwig strove

tion, will attempt to give a detailed discussion of the significances of the title and to consider their relation to each other and to the structure of the novel.

A consideration of the remarks of one important critic, Richard Brinkmann, raises the main issues in regard to the title and provides a good introduction to the whole problem. In *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, Brinkmann writes:

> In gewissen Eigentümlichkeiten des Dachdeckerhandwerks und in den Vorgängen dieser besonderen Dachdeckergeschichte will er [Ludwig] bedeutsame, ja wohl sogar symbolische Zeichen für allgemein-menschliche Wesenszüge und für die besonderen seelischen Lagen und Haltungen der beteiligten Personen erblicken. Zum Beispiel: Wie des Schieferdeckers Reich zwischen Himmel und Erde ist, so ist auch des Menschen Statt, so soll auch sein Wandel überhaupt zwischen Himmel und Erde sein; ... Doch die Beziehung, die Ludwig selbst in den einfachen empirischen Tatsachen, in der Verschlingung der Kausalketten gegründet sieht, ist nicht von objektiv-symbolischem Charakter. Die Deutung auf einen innewohnenden bedeutsamen, ja symbolischen Sinn hin entstammt vielmehr einer rein rationalen Setzung des Dichters. Was über die Tatsächlichkeit des besonderen Geschehens hinausgeht, ist Interpretation, Sinn*gebung*, *Verallgemeinerung* aus dem Verstande des Dichters.[5]

We agree with Brinkmann that Ludwig continually interprets and comments as omniscient author on the events of the novel. This ration-

---

for and of which the story is one of the best embodiments" (p. 276). Hohlfeld does not discuss the significance of the title in the work itself, but this should surely be the main task of the critic concerned to interpret the novel *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Cf. also Kracke, 23). – Griessmann (pp. 189, 196) sees with Besch (p. 25) the progress of the repairs of St. Georg as a "Gleichnis", not a symbol. The symbolic nature of the title is, thus, also denied. Our interpretation will serve as an answer to their opinion. – Kracke (pp. 22-26), Witte (pp. 67, 69, 70, 75) and McClain (pp. 61-63) analyse a few (at the most five) passages where the title occurs and assign it definite significances. These will be considered during the present interpretation. Brinkmann's denial of the symbolic nature of the title (pp. 202-203) will also be discussed in detail. The reason for objecting so strongly to the above critics' failure to consider *all* the occurrences of the title does not arise from pedantry, but from the undeniable fact that only in this way can the full scope of the use of the title be grasped. Unlike the leitmotifs, whose ironic significance can be shown by considering a few central occurrences, the title is intended to suggest a different significance on almost every occurrence, and these cannot be perceived unless all are examined.

[5] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 202-203.

alization of their significance is one of the main characteristics of his method of narration. However, the problem of the symbolical significance of the title is a most involved one which cannot be solved by simply stating, as Brinkmann does, that Ludwig intended the title to be a symbol, but was unsuccessful in achieving this, that it was merely a case of "Sinn*gebung, Verallgemeinerung* aus dem Verstande des Dichters". To prove the point one way or the other, the critic would have to take examples of the occurrence of the title in the novel and investigate the symbolical significances, if any, it has on each occasion. In other words, Brinkmann should tell us what meaning Ludwig has attempted to give the title, just what generalization he has tried to make. All Brinkmann says of the slater's domain between heaven and earth is that slater is intended to stand for man in general. It is a major omission if the critic, however, makes no attempt to explain those words which Ludwig chose as the title of his novel, for, without further interpretation, the statement that man's domain is between heaven and earth means little to us.[6]

I

Examining the passages where the title occurs in the text of the novel, we find it first in section four which describes the beginning of the repairs of St. Georg.

> Zwischen Himmel und Erde ist des Schieferdeckers Reich. Tief unten das lärmende Gewühl der Wanderer der Erde, hoch oben die Wanderer des Himmels, die stillen Wolken in ihrem grossen Gang. Monden, Jahre, Jahrzehnte lang hat es keine Bewohner, als der krächzenden Dohlen unruhig flatternd Volk. Aber eines Tages öffnet sich in der Mitte der Thurmdachhöhe die enge Ausfahrtthür; unsichtbare Hände schieben zwei Rüststangen heraus. Dem Zuschauer von unten gemahnt es, sie wollen eine Brücke von Strohhalmen in den Himmel bauen. Die Dohlen haben sich auf Thurmknopf und Wetterfahne geflüchtet und sehen herab und sträuben ihr Gefieder vor Angst. Die Rüststangen stehen wenige Fuss heraus und die unsichtbaren Hände lassen vom Schieben ab. Dafür

---

[6] In *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, Fritz Martini repeats Brinkmann's view, but again without any attempt to say what the symbol is intended to stand for (p. 467).

beginnt ein Hämmern im Herzen des Dachstuhls. Die schlafenden Eulen schrecken auf und taumeln aus ihren Lucken zackig in das offene Auge des Tages hinein. Die Dohlen hören es mit Entsetzen; das Menschenkind unten auf der festen Erde vernimmt es nicht, die Wolken oben am Himmel ziehen gleichmüthig darüber hin.[7]

The suggestion which the picture of the slater conveys as he works high up on the steeple is that of his aloneness, his isolation in this deserted domain. We read of the indifference to the slater and to his activity of the clouds above him, "die Wanderer des Himmels", and the people below him, "die Wanderer der Erde". The slater is *between* heaven and earth in the sense that he has no connection with what is happening in these spheres. He is isolated from them. This interpretation of the significance of the title here is supported by other evidence and also other passages where the title occurs. The frequently employed symbol of the clouds' passing, which occurs twice in the above passage, is related in its significance to that of the image "zwischen Himmel und Erde". The clouds' indifference to man and his lot suggests not merely the gulf between man and nature, but rather that there is no sphere beyond the human which sympathizes with man. In the description of the slater's preparations for the repairs of St. Georg, the clouds' indifferent passing is metioned on four further occasions: ". . . nur die Wolken am Himmel gehen unberührt ihren Pfad über ihn hin"; [8] ". . . die Wolken hoch am Himmel haben sich nie um ihn gekümmert"; [9] "Aber er kümmert sich so wenig um die Berge, wie die Wolken um ihn. . . . hoch oben gehen noch die Wanderer des Himmels, die stillen Wolken, ihren grossen Gang, . . ." [10] The indifference of everything beyond the human sphere to man is also most forcefully expressed by the clouds' passing in the section describing Fritz's death. When he falls from the steeple, we read of the feeling of horror which this arouses in the human witnesses of the event, but the passage continues: "Aber oben hoch die Wolken am Himmel achten es nicht und gehen unberührt darüber weiter ihren grossen Gang. Sie sehen des selbstgeschaffenen Elends so viel unter sich, dass das einzelne sie nicht bewegen kann." [11] Thus man is isolated. He has no contact with any sphere beyond the human which sympathizes with him.[12]

---

[7] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 66-67.
[8] *Ibid.*, 68.
[9] *Ibid.*, 69.
[10] *Ibid.*, 70.

The interpretation of the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde" as standing for isolation is further supported by its occurrences in section fourteen where Ludwig describes Herr Nettenmair's decision to force Fritz to jump from the steeple of St. Georg. We are already told at the beginning of the section that Fritz is between heaven and earth.[13] Later, Ludwig more significantly interrupts his portrayal of the struggle within Fritz and his father to describe their surroundings: "Es war ein Abend voll Gottesfriedens. Tief unten weit hingedehnt die grüne Erde; oben hoch der Himmel, wie ein Kelch aus blauem Krystall darüber gedeckt. Kleine rosige Wölkchen wie Flocken hineingestreut. . . . Hoch am Himmel und tief auf der Erde, überall Gottesfrieden und süss aufgelöstes Hinsehnen nach Ruhe." [14] Everything is filled with divine calm. Only the human participants in the scene, Fritz and his father, do not share the peace of their surroundings, the tranquillity of nature and the divine. "Nur zwischen Himmel und Erde die beiden Menschen auf dem Kirchdach zu Sankt Georg fühlen nicht seine Flügel. Nur über sie vermag er nichts. In dem einen brennt der Wahnsinn überreizten Ehrgefühls, in dem andern alle Flammen, alle Qualen der Hölle." [15] Once more the isolation of human beings, "Menschen" not just slaters, is emphasized. There is a gulf between man and everything beyond him. Man's domain is "zwischen Himmel und Erde" and he is *between* heaven and earth in the sense that he has contact with neither. He does not share the calmness of nature and the divine here. He is excluded from the spirit which pervades his surroundings.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, 248. Clouds, and mist, are mentioned on several other occasions in the novel. They are employed in two ways. Firstly, the clouds or mist suggest the individual's isolation in self from reality as in the following descriptions of Herr Nettenmair and Fritz: "Der alte Herr sass in seiner kleinen Stube. Wie er sich immer tiefer in die Wolken einspann, die ihn von der Welt ausser ihm trennten, wurde ihm zuletzt auch das Gärtchen fremd" (p. 188, also p. 82). "Die Klarheit des Blitzes müsste schwinden und der alte Wahn hüllte die Dinge wieder in seine verstellenden Nebel" (p. 168). (The cloud and mist images here suggest the same alienation as they do in Hesse's well-known poem "Seltsam im Nebel zu wandern!") The clouds are secondly an outward sign of threatening inner conflict. For example, in the famous description of the storm, the clouds and, indeed, the whole storm are the external illustration of Apollonius' inner struggle. Ludwig, as narrator, has himself carried out what he tells us the villagers attempted to do at the beginning of the storm: "[sie kleideten] ihre innerliche Beklemmung in entsprechende Bilder von etwas äusserlich drohend Bevorstehendem" (p. 273).

[12] Fritz Martini is also of this opinion. In *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, he writes: "Dies Leben kennt keine überwölbende Harmonie mehr. 'Aber oben hoch die Wolken am Himmel achten es nicht und gehen unberührt darüber hin weiter ihren grossen Gang. Sie sehen des selbstgeschaffenen Elends soviel unter sich, dass das einzelne sie nicht bewegen kann.' Der Mensch ist auf sich allein zurückgewiesen" (p. 469). – Thus we must object to Witte's statement: "Einen Bereich eigener Gesetzlichkeit ausserhalb des Menschlichen gibt es nicht. Die Natur wird, soweit sie überhaupt sichtbar wird, in die Gesetzlichkeit menschlicher Ordnung einbezogen, oder sie wird eben nur soweit sichtbar gemacht, als sie ein Bild des Menschlichen abgibt" (p. 76, note 1). Nature does have its own domain and "Gesetzlichkeit" in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and it is rather from nature's sphere and rhythm of existence that man is excluded. The symbol of the clouds illustrates this as does the other symbol which will be analysed in the next chapter.

[13] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 200.

At the beginning of the second paragraph of the passage from section four, the indifference of the clouds is referred to and then we are shown the slater's acceptance of his isolated domain. He takes no notice of what is happening above or below him, being conscious only of his own activity. "Er sieht nicht hinab, wo die Erde mit grünen Armen lockt, er sieht nicht hinauf, wo vom Zug der Wolken am Himmel der tödtliche Schwindel herabtaumeln kann auf sein festes Auge. Die Mitte der Sprossen ist die Bahn seines Blickes und oben steht er. Es gibt keinen Himmel und keine Erde für ihn, als die Helmstange und die Leiter, die er mit seinem Tau zusammenknüpft. Der Knoten ist geschlungen; die Zuschauer athmen auf und rühmen auf allen Strassen den kühnen Mann und sein Thun hoch oben zwischen Himmel und Erde." [16] This indicates once more the isolation of the slater. He knows nothing and feels no need of anything beyond his immediate perception: "Es gibt keinen Himmel und keine Erde für ihn, als die Helmstange und die Leiter, die er mit seinem Tau zusammenknüpft." The universe has shrunk to the objects of his immediate surroundings.

The danger of the slater's activity is also indicated during the passage from section four.[17] "Die fliegende Rüstung ist fertig. So nennt sie ihr Baumeister, dem sie eine Brücke zum Himmel werden kann, ohne dass er es begehrt." [18] This danger is most threatening between heaven and earth, when the slater climbs onto the steeple to attach his ladders. "Dann ist er erst recht zwischen Himmel und Erde. Er weiss, die leichteste Verschiebung der Leiter – und ein einziger falscher Tritt kann sie verschieben – stürzt ihn rettungslos hinab in den sichern Tod."[19] There are further passages in the text which support this interpretation of the symbol as also suggesting the precariousness of the slater's, or man's, isolated position. It is used twice with this significance in connection with Apollonius. "Das war der Schwindel, des Schieferdeckers ärgster, tückischster Feind, wenn er ihn plötzlich zwischen Himmel und Erde auf der schwanken Leiter fasst!"[20] The feelings of the townspeople as they watch Apollonius' attempts to extinguish the fire on the steeple of St. Georg during the storm are described as follows: "Keiner glaubte es, und doch stand jeder Einzelne selbst auf der Leiter, und unter ihm schaukelte der leichte Span in Sturm und Blitz und Donner hoch zwischen Himmel und Erde. Und sie standen doch auch wieder unten auf der festen Erde und sahen nur hinauf; und doch, wenn der Mann stürzte, dann waren sie's, die stürzten. . . . Sie vergassen die Gefahr der Stadt, ihre eigene über der Gefahr des Menschen da oben, die ja doch ihre eigene war."[21] The danger to which the slater is exposed in his isolated domain between heaven and earth is here presented as the danger to which all the townspeople are exposed and the slater's experience represents an experience of man in general.[22]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 204.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

---

[17] Kracke (p. 22) has drawn attention to this significance of the title, one which is plausible in the novel itself. Unfortunately, however, he does not continue his essay in this vein. In the section entitled "Der schöpferische Gehalt des Titels", Kracke gives, with no support from the text of the novel, the following significances to the title: "1. Der Mensch ist ein Geschöpf der Erde; in den Himmel kommen, heisst sterben. 2. Der Mensch klebt an kleinen, irdischen Dingen, doch est ist etwas in ihm, das sich nach Ewigkeit sehnt und Grösse will; aber: 'die Freiheit und das Himmelreich gewinnen keine Halben' (E. M. Arndt).... 3. Aber des Menschen Los zwischen den Geschöpfen der Erde und dem Schöpfer im Himmel ist schwer" (pp. 22-23). Kracke supports his second and third above interpretations of the title by quotations from a poem of Ludwig and from Goethe's "Grenzen der Menschheit". Kracke quotes the following lines from Goethe's poem, ignoring the division into verses and reversing the stanza order: "Steht er mit festen, markigen Knochen auf der wohlgegründeten Erde: reicht er nicht auf, nur mit der Eiche oder der Rebe sich zu vergleichen. – Hebt er sich aufwärts und berührt mit dem Scheitel die Sterne: nirgends haften dann die unsichern Sohlen, und mit ihm spielen Wolken und Winde" (p. 23). The danger in Kracke's introduction of passages from other works to explain the title of Ludwig's novel is shown by the fact that in Goethe's poem the clouds play with man, i.e., they do what they want with him, he is their plaything, whereas in Ludwig's novel the clouds pass indifferently by him, and this ignoring of man by the clouds has been shown to be related in its significance to that of the title. Kracke's interpretations are, no doubt, valid for Ludwig's and Goethe's poems, but it is difficult to see their importance for the title of Ludwig's novel, especially since Kracke does not support his remarks by any detailed reference to occurrences of the title where it would possess these symbolical significances. – Further evidence of the change from an attempt at finding a symbolic significance of the title plausible in the novel itself to a listing of the associations, literary and personal, which it has for him is Kracke's statement that the title signifies: "Der ewige Abstand des Realisten und Idealisten im Leben und in der Kunst, den Ludwig zu überwinden rang!" (p. 23). As has been indicated above, this is the same interpretation Alexander Hohlfeld formed of the title. It expresses an opinion concerning the development of Ludwig's literary and theoretical writings held by several critics, e.g., Alexander Hohfeld, William H. McClain, and Arthur Kracke himself, but it has no justification as an interpretation of the symbolic significance of the title in the structure of the novel, *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It removes the title from the sphere of the work with which it is connected and to which it owes its existence. It is in relation to the structure of the novel itself that the symbolic significance of the title must be shown or denied.

[18] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 67.

Summarizing, we may, for the moment, say that the symbol, "zwischen Himmel und Erde", as it is used in the above-quoted passages, reveals the isolation of the slater or, since Ludwig intends the slater's experiences to be general human ones, the isolation of man and the danger to which he is exposed by the precariousness of his isolated position.

II

The significance of the symbol explained here seems to be the original one intended by Ludwig since, being related to the dominant motif of isolation in the novel, it has a place in the work considered as a whole. The symbol, however, occurs several more times in the work and it is a mark of Ludwig's immaturity as an artist and lack of clarity about his intentions in this novel that he uses the symbol with several different meanings which do not always achieve symbolic force and which are sometimes contradictory of each other. The significance of the symbol, thus, becomes confused.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, 67-68.

[20] *Ibid.*, 264.

[21] *Ibid.*, 291-292.

[22] Cf. also *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 70, 252, for further occurrences of the title which emphasize the danger of the slater's or man's position.

A weakening of the symbol can already be seen in the above-quoted examples concerning the danger of the slater's or man's isolated position. They tend to suggest merely the momentary danger of Apollonius' physical position on the steeple rather than that of man's isolation, of which Fritz's development, his insanity due to his complete alienation from those about him, would be a good illustration.

At the end of section six, Fritz's anxious state of mind and his increasing misunderstanding of Apollonius are described. "Eben so rastlos umschwankte seines Bruders Furcht, das dunkle Etwas, das über ihm schwankte, und ihn zu begraben drohte; noch emsiger hämmerte sein Herz an den brechenden Planen, den Sturz zu hindern; aber sein Gedankenschiff hing nicht zwischen Himmel und Erde, von des Himmels Licht bewahrt; es taumelte tiefer und immer tiefer, zwischen Erd' und Hölle, und die Hölle zeichnete ihn immer dunkler mit ihrer Glut." [23] Here, "zwischen Himmel und Erde" seems to signify a level of clarity, of insight and understanding from which Fritz is falling into ever-increasing confusion, to "zwischen Erd' und Hölle", which obscures things for him. This is also suggested by the contrast of light and dark, "Licht" and "dunkel".

Of Christiane's reaction to Ännchen's remarks that Apollonius does not despise her, we read: "Das kleine Mädchen sah mit ihnen [Apollonius' eyes] auf zu ihr [Christiane], und erzählte vom Onkel, wie lieb und gut er sei. Oder erzählte sie von damals? Es war keine Zeit mehr, Sonst und Jetzt war eins. Die letzte Aehnlichkeit mit Fritz Nettenmair war aus ihrem Antlitz verschwunden. Ihre Seele schauerte hoch oben zwischen Himmel und Erde." [24] There is here a description of Christiane's reawakening love for Apollonius. "Zwischen Himmel und Erde" can mean either that she feels herself emotionally uplifted by her love or that she is thinking of Apollonius whom she has been watching as he works on the steeple of St. Georg and who is thus, at that moment, physically between heaven and earth. In this example, as in the one above concerning Fritz, "zwischen Himmel und Erde" has the effect of a flourish used to emphasize the importance of the moment. Ludwig introduces the phrase whenever he feels a certain heightening of mood, a certain pathos is required. A further example of this is when Christiane hears Apollonius walking towards her after she has been convinced of his death: "Die junge Frau hielt sich fest an dem Thürpfosten, als sie den Schritt hörte durch den Schuppen. Aber auch der Thürpfosten stand nicht mehr fest, sie selbst nicht mehr auf dem festen Boden; sie schwindelte zwischen Himmel und Erde." [25] The only other purpose "zwischen Himmel und Erde" fulfills here is to describe Christiane's swoon.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, 100.

[24] *Ibid.*, 93.

In sections twelve and thirteen, the symbol acquires a further association. In section thirteen it is not Ludwig who comments and analyses, but one of the characters who elucidates its meaning. Herr Nettenmair interprets the slater's hovering between heaven and earth to signify man's dependence on providence. This is an extension of the symbol in its meaning of the precariousness of man's isolated position. "Gott wird ja vor sein, dass der Junge [Apollonius] nicht zu Unglück kommt, aber es kann geschehen, und es its vielleicht schon geschehen. Wie leicht kommt einer hinter dem Ofen dazu, geschweige ein Schieferdecker, der zwischen Himmel und Erde schwebt wie ein Vogel, aber keine Flügel hat wie ein Vogel. Darum mit ist die edle Schieferdeckerkunst eine so edle Kunst, weil der Schieferdecker das sichtlichste Bild ist, wie die Fürsehung den Menschen in ihren Händen hält, wenn er in seinem ehrlichen Berufe handtiert. Und lässt sie ihn fallen, so weiss sie, warum; . . ." [26] Nettenmair's extension of the precariousness of the slater's or man's isolated position between heaven and earth to signify his dependence on providence comes not from an inherent fatalism, but, when the passage is taken in its context, from an attempt to silence Valentin's, Nettenmair's servant's, fears that Fritz has plans to murder Apollonius. Nettenmair's interpretation of the slater between heaven and earth is merely a ruse to preserve the honor of his family by placing the blame for Apollonius' presumed death elsewhere.

---

[25] *Ibid.*, 222.

[26] *Ibid.*, 195-196.

In conclusion, Nettenmair says to Valentin: ". . . und der Mensch soll nicht Gespinnste d'rum hängen, die über einen Andern Unglück oder gar Schande bringen können. Ich bin gewiss, die Sache wird sich ausweisen, wie sie ist, und nicht, wie Er sie sich da zusammengeängstelt hat." [27] After this conversation with Valentin, Herr Nettenmair goes to St. Georg where Fritz is working. His accustation that Fritz has murdered Apollonius and his insistence that Fritz jump to his death from the steeple to prevent the family's honor being sullied reveal Nettenmair's lack of conviction that providence has had anything to do with Apollonius' supposed death.[28]

In section twelve the symbol is once more interpreted explicitly in the text to signify the slater's dependence on the whims of fate. "Das Schicksal hat den Schieferdecker, der zwischen Himmel und Erde hängt, in seiner Hand. Das Schicksal hält ihn oder lässt ihn fallen, nicht das Seil oder ein Schnitt darin. Will es ihn halten, schadet kein Schnitt; soll er fallen, reisst ein unversehrtes Seil. Und das Schicksal hat ihn schon gezeichnet. Ein Tag früher, einer später, was ist das, wenn er doch fallen muss?" [29] This passage is not, as it may at first appear, an analysis of the symbol by the omniscient narrator. Here Ludwig has assumed Fritz's point of view and is narrating his thoughts. The first sentence of the paragraph which follows the above passage makes this clear: "All' diese Gedanken schlug mit einem Schlage jener eine [the thought of fate] aus Nettenmairs Seele!" If these are Fritz's thoughts, does he really believe that the slater is subject to the whims of fate? There is once more the same situation as with Herr Nettenmair. Fritz had dreamed Apollonius would fall to his death from the steeple of St. Georg. He watches Apollonius working and expects him to fall every minute. When this does not happen, Fritz seizes on the idea of giving fate a helping hand. "Da fährt ein Gedanke wie ein dunkelglühender Blitz durch den Krampf, in den all' seine Gefühle zusammengeballt sind; der Gedanke, dem Schicksal nachzuhelfen. . . . Das Schicksal will seine Hülfe; drum legt es selber ihm Tau und Beil in die Hand. Wer weiss, dass er hier war?" [30] Fritz's interpretation of the slater's position between heaven and earth to signify his dependence on the whims of fate is thus merely balm for his bad conscience, an attempt to argue away his sense of guilt in regard to his plan to damage Apollonius' ropes. A belief in providence or fate plays no part in the lives of the characters in this novel. They do not actually rely upon any supernatural power, as Herr Nettenmair's and Fritz's actions referred to above clearly show, but attempt to control their own lives. Fritz's insanity and death are also, as we are explicitly told, "selbstgeschaffen".[31] It is, therefore, difficult to see what function this interpretation of the symbol by Herr Nettenmair and Fritz has in the novel, i.e., apart from the momentary one of a ruse to hide the truth from another person in the case of Herr Nettenmair and from himself in Fritz's case. It is not a mark of artistic maturity that Ludwig allows his characters to extend one of his major symbol's original meanings by giving it an interpretation *in which they do not believe* (if they did believe in it, it would have an ironic significance revealing their further misunderstanding of reality) and which has no place in the finite, rational world of his novel where one of Ludwig's avowed intentions was to demonstrate how each person determines by himself the course of his own particular life.[32]

---

[27] *Ibid.*, 196.

[28] *Ibid.*, 205-210.

[29] *Ibid.*, 178.

[30] *Ibid.*, 177-178.

The last important occurrence of the symbol is at the very end of the work.

> Von Glück und Unglück reden die Menschen, das der Himmel ihnen bringe! Was die Menschen Glück und Unglück nennen, ist nur der rohe

---

[31] *Ibid.*, 248; 8.

[32] Cf. Ludwig's draft of a letter, presumably to Eduard Devrient, concerning his intentions in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Merker, III, xviii-xxii). We shall quote from this letter further on. – On account of the interpretation given above, we must disagree with Elisabeth Witte's description of the characters as torn between "positive" and "negative", between "good" and "bad" forces which take possession of them and of which they are the victims (pp. 67, 69, 70, 75). Witte interprets "Himmel" as "das Gute" and "Erde" as "das Böse" (p. 75) without showing what validity these significances would have for the work as a whole. This conception, indeed, seems most foreign to Ludwig's novel and the indifference of heaven and earth to the slater contradicts the view that they struggle for possession of man. These domains are also rather united than opposed as, for example, in the description of Fritz and his father on the steeple of St. Georg where both heaven and earth are pervaded by divine tranquillity in contrast to the "hell" in the minds of the two human beings. Here, obviously, it can also hardly be argued that "Erde" is evil.

> Stoff dazu; am Menschen liegt's, wozu er ihn formt. Nicht der Himmel bringt das Glück; der Mensch bereitet sich sein Glück und spannt seinen Himmel selber in der eigenen Brust. Der Mensch soll nicht sorgen, dass er in den Himmel, sondern dass der Himmel in ihn komme. Wer ihn nicht in sich selber trägt, der sucht ihn vergebens im ganzen All. Lass dich vom Verstande leiten, aber verletze nicht die heilige Schranke des Gefühls. Kehre dich nicht tadelnd von der Welt wie sie ist; suche ihr gerecht zu werden, dann wirst du dir gerecht. Und in diesem Sinne sei dein Wandel: Zwischen Himmel und Erde! [33]

"Himmel" has two meanings here. In the sentence: "Von Glück und Unglück reden die Menschen, das der Himmel ihnen bringe", it stands for some power outside the human sphere which causes man to be happy or unhappy. This belief is, however, rejected in the next sentence. Man creates his own happiness or unhappiness and is not dependent on any external power for these. In the third sentence, "Himmel" undergoes a change in meaning. The first part of the sentence is a restatement of Ludwig's conviction that man must create his own happiness: "Nicht der Himmel bringt das Glück; der Mensch bereitet sich sein Glück. . . ." The remainder of the sentence continues to express the same idea, but "Himmel" now has the sense of a place of happiness within man. Man is to create his own heaven within himself in the sense that he is to find happiness within and not to expect it to come from without. The next sentence repeats this conviction. The last sentence concerning "Himmel" says that there is no heaven other than the one which man creates within himself. It denies the existence of a power outside man which directs his life. In his statement here, Ludwig rejects the idea that man's life is subject to the whims of fate or any other external, supernatural power.

In the remainder of the passage we are told that man should adopt the golden mean in all things. He is to be guided by reason, but not at the expense of his emotions; he is not to turn away from the world, as, for example, we were told Herr Nettenmair did,[34] he is not to isolate himself, but is to attempt to find contact with the world about him. Ludwig summarizes his final remarks by writing: "Und in diesem Sinne sei dein Wandel: Zwischen Himmel und Erde."

---

[33] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 305-306.

[34] *Ibid.*, 82, 188, etc.

From the interpretation in the text which has preceded the symbol here, it is intended to signify not man's dependence on fate or providence, but his ability to control his own life. Ludwig has reversed the symbol's acquired significance of man's dependence on a supernatural power given it by Herr Nettenmair and Fritz and also, it would seem, the significance of man's isolation, his lack of contact with the world about him.[35] However, the symbol is in no way expressive of these new meanings. Coming as it does at the very end, it has the effect of a final chord which is intended to be resonant with many meanings, but which, on the contrary, is flat and signifies nothing.[36]

This final passage of the novel also purports to be a summary of the significance of the whole work. Brinkmann, too, is of this opinion. Shortly before he asks whether Ludwig is not merely reading a symbolic meaning into the events and into the slater's domain between heaven and earth, he writes: 'Es ist charakteristisch, dass die Erzählung mit einer theoretischen Lehre endet, in der umständlich der Gehalt der Geschichte formuliert ist." [37] But how is this final passage a formulation of the "Gehalt" of the work? Brinkmann has perceived only part of the meaning of the final passage. He writes: " 'Der Mensch soll nicht sorgen, dass er in den Himmel, sondern dass der Himmel in ihn komme. Wer ihn nicht in sich selber trägt, der sucht ihn vergebens im ganzen All.' Nicht mehr ein objektives Gesetz legitimiert das Handeln der Menschen, sondern das relative 'subjektive Gesetz', das 'ihm in die Brust gegeben' ist." [38] Brinkmann is here quoting from Ludwig's remarks in reference to his intention in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde,* namely to show that man is not dependent on any supernatural power, but directs by his own particular nature the course of his own particular life.[39] In this sense the final passage is a statement of the "Gehalt" of the novel. However, this is not all that is said there. Brinkmann has failed to see the final passage in relation to the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde", to perceive the attempted reversal here of the symbol's previous significance and the contradiction thus involved for the work as a whole.[40]

---

[35] Thus, W. H. McClain approached the problem closely when he wrote of the final passage: ". . . the moral passage at the end has a somewhat hollow ring. For the picture of loneliness which it [the novel *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] shows us does not correspond to the conciliatory view of human life which the final passage proclaims" (p. 65). McClain, however, failed to connect this conclusion with the use of the symbol in the final paragraph, believing that its use was valid, and not seeing the significance of the symbol here in relation to its significances on the other occasions it occurs in the novel.

[36] Arthur Kracke questioned the validity of the final passage of the novel in reference to the occurrence of the title there: "Ich glaube, dass jeder feinfühlige Leser die Schlussbetrachtung des Buches ein wenig gequält findet. Zu deutlich ist das Bemühen des Dichters, seine Predigt mit dem Titel zu schliessen; und mit zu vielen Bedeutungen ist dieser Kehrreim beladen" (p. 25).

[37] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 201.

[38] *Ibid.*, 215.

---

[39] Cf. note 32 above.

[40] The same comment may be made on Witte's (pp. 64-65) and Forest's (p. 45) remarks about the final passage and the symbol's occurrence there. – William H. McClain has used a large section of his chapter on *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in *Between Real and Ideal. The Course of Otto Ludwig's Development as a Narrative Writer* to examine the symbolical significance, the "higher meaning" (p. 61) of the title of the novel. According to McClain, "The main implication of the phrase 'Zwischen Himmel und Erde' is that human happiness is found in a just balance between the spiritual and physical sides of our [i.e., man's] nature, . . ." (p. 62). This interpretation of the title seems to be obtained, although McClain does not say so, from its occurrence in the final passage of the novel where Ludwig writes of how man can attain happiness by saying that: "Der Mensch soll nicht sorgen, dass er in den Himmel, sondern dass der Himmel in ihn komme. . . . Kehre dich nicht tadelnd von der Welt wie sie ist; suche ihr gerecht zu werden, dann wirst du dir gerecht. Und in diesem Sinne sei dein Wandel: Zwischen Himmel und Erde!" (p. 324). McClain takes the final passage of the novel to mean that man is to concern himself with 'Himmel" = spiritual = ideal and with "Erde" = physical = world. This becomes obvious when he continues his above-quoted interpretation of the title and explicitly uses these terms. McClain's whole sentence is: "The main implication of the phrase 'Zwischen Himmel und Erde' is that human happiness is found in a just balance between the spiritual and physical sides of our nature, since for most human beings happiness is best realized in an existence which is lived in terms of spiritual goals and ideals, but in which worldly pleasures also have their just place" (p. 62). We have been forced to connect this interpretation of the title with its occurrence in the final passage of the novel because McClain himself gives no example of where the title occurs with this "main implication" (p. 62). We must confess that we also can find no occurrence of the title with McClain's main implication other than perhaps, that in the final passage and, here too, it is not, as has been shown above, satisfactory. It is, moreover, most unsatisfactory when we ask how it fits into the structure of the novel as a whole. Do the characters in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* not achieve happiness because they find no "just balance between the spiritual and physical sides" of their natures, because their existence is not one "which is lived in therms of spiritual goals and ideals, . . . [and] in which worldly pleasures also have their just place"? The characters seem hardly concerned with spiritual matters. Should they be? Is this the reason for all the confusion, misunderstanding and unhappiness in the novel

III

It must now be considered whether Ludwig has succeeded in his intention of making the slater's experiences stand for general human

---

and not the characters' isolation from one another? – McClain's interpretation of the main implication of the title appears a slight variation of the one Hohlfeld and Kracke made, namely that the title has to do with the problem of the real and the ideal. McClain writes of "spiritual goals and ideals" and their opposite, the "physical" and the "worldly", which man should attempt to combine. To substitute "real" for "physical" and "worldly" does no violence to McClain's statement and makes clear that his interpretation of the title comes from his thesis that the course of Otto Ludwig's development as a narrative writer may be characterized by calling it "between real and ideal", as, indeed, is the title of McClain's study of Ludwig's narrative writings. The only difference between Hohlfeld's and Kracke's interpretations and McClain's is that Hohlfeld and Kracke, in giving the title the significance of between real and ideal undisguisedly remove it from the novel and interpret it in relation to Ludwig's development as an artist and to his aesthetic theories. McClain, however, claims that, with a significance of "happiness is best realized in an existence which is lived in terms of spiritual goals and ideals, but in which worldly pleasures also have their just place", the title has a function *in* the novel itself. McClain, as we pointed out above, does not, however, show where the title occurs with this significance and what its function in the novel as a whole is supposed to be. – When McClain explicitly discusses the occurrence of the title in the final passage of the novel, he contents himself with almost a mere translation of the passage. He writes "What these things seem to say is this: that although men are prone to speak of their happiness or unhappiness as heaven-sent, what they call happiness or unhappiness is but raw material which must be shaped in some way. For heaven does not send man happiness; he prepares his own happiness and raises heaven in his own heart. If we can bring heaven into ourselves, Ludwig continues, we need have no care about going to heaven; and whoever does not carry heaven within himself will search in vain for it through all the universe. A double exhortation follows: that man should use reason as a guide in shaping his life, but not to the detriment of feeling; and that he should not turn away disapprovingly from the world as it is, but seek to do justice to the world. For in being just to the world he will also be just to himself. In this spirit, the passage concludes, man should live his life between heaven and earth" (pp. 62-63). It is, however, as Kracke noted (cf. note 36 above) not at all clear what this "spirit" is in reference to the title here. Also, how does the use of the title in this final passage connect with its function on its other occurrences throughout the novel? Writing further on of the moral content of the final passage, McClain perceives that it clashes with the novel as a whole, but this, as we have remarked before, does not lead him to question the validity of Ludwig's use of the symbol in the final passage (cf. note 35). Cf. also my review of McClain's book, in *Etudes Germaniques*, 77 (1965), 84-85.

ones. Brinkmann, as has been shown, is of the opinion that Ludwig was not successful in this, whereas Arthur Kracke questions: "Zeigt er [Ludwig] nicht . . . die zeitlos gültige Menschennatur in enger kleinstädtischer Handwerkerwelt?",[41] and W. H. McClain states that Ludwig uses "the situation of the slater symbolically as a means of communicating some general truths about human life".[42] Our above analysis has already demonstrated that Brinkmann's statement: "Die Deutung auf einen innewohnenden bedeutsamen, ja symbolischen Sinn hin entstammt vielmehr einer rein rationalen Setzung des Dichters" [43] does not do justice to the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde" and is not sufficient to explain its failure. Brinkmann's argument is also not sufficient to prove that Ludwig has been unsuccessful in making the slater's condition stand for a general human one. The reasons for the phrase "zwischen Himmel und Erde" gradually losing its symbolic force are to be found, as we have shown above, in Ludwig's artistic failings: his lack of clarity about his intentions concerning the symbol and the confusion and contradiction this brings about within the artistic structure of the novel. These are also the reasons why the slater's condition between heaven and earth fails to symbolize a condition of man in general.

We have stated that the most important motif in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is that of isolation and that this isolation is present among the three male members of the Nettenmair family, a family of slaters. However, in the description of the Cousin's family in Cologne we are told that here there is *no* isolation, here there is, in the true sense of the word, "Zusammenleben".[44] The Cousin is also the exact opposite of Herr Nettenmair. He discusses all problems with his family and workmen. He is not locked in self as Herr Nettenmair is,[45] but can open his heart to others and reveal what is taking place within him. This is true also of all the members of the Cousin's family. They understand each other. They talk openly with each other. They have contact with each other.

---

[41] "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* als Otto Ludwigs ureigentes Werk", 23.

[42] *Between Real and Ideal,* 61.

[43] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 203.

[44] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde,* 24.

[45] *Ibid.*, 82, 188, etc.

> Über Dinge, die das Geschäft nicht betrafen, redete er [Herr Nettenmair] mit den Söhnen gar nicht. Dagegen war es des Vetters Weise, ehe er selbst seine Ansicht über einen Punkt des Geschäftes aussprach, seine Gehülfen um ihre Meinung zu fragen. Es war dann nicht genug an der Meinung, er wollte auch die Gründe wissen. Dann machte er Einwürfe; war ihre Meinung die richtige, mussten sie dieselbe siegreich durchkämpfen; irrten sie, so nöthigte er sie, durch eigenes Denken auf das Rechte zu kommen. . . . Und so hielt er es auch mit andern Dingen. Es waren wenig Verhältnisse des bürgerlichen Lebens, die er nicht nach seiner Weise mit seiner Familie . . . durchsprach.[46]

The Cousin, unlike Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius, also does not presume that everyone is the same as himself. The Cousin is the character in the novel who perceives the dangers which Apollonius' tendency to take virtues to extremes may involve for him and he perceives this characteristic in Apollonius although his relation is the opposite of himself.[47] The Cousin can, therefore, transcend a purely subjective interpretation of reality which sees people and events in the false light of its own limited possibilities and does not make the mistake of presuming that others are the same as he himself is, as Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius mostly do. Of the Cousin it cannot be said: "Wie er es selbst nicht besass, fehlte ihm auch der Sinn, es an Andern wahrzunehmen",[48] or: "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" [49] as Ludwig says of Fritz.[50]

Having thus characterized the Cousin and his family, it must now be asked what function they fulfill in the novel. The Cologne family forms an exact contrast to the Nettenmair family. It possesses none of the traits of isolation existing in the Nettenmair family. In no sense in which we have used the term are the members of the Cologne family isolated. The function of the Cologne family, then, is to illuminate by contrast the particular characteristic of the Nettenmair family, the characteristic which distinguishes it and its members from other families and other people. Isolation is thus presented as being a particular, a special feature of the three male members of the Nettenmair family. It is *not* a general human characteristic.

---

[46] *Ibid.*, 24-25.

[47] *Ibid.*, 25.

[48] *Ibid.*, 76.

[49] *Ibid.*, 65.

[50] Brinkmann's following statement, with which Witte (p. 71) agreed, is thus incorrect insofar as the "alle" is concerned: "Wie Apollonius und Fritz so leben auch die anderen Menschen alle in der Erzählung in der Befangenheit, in der oft dumpfen Befangenheit ihrer eigenen Vorstellungen, die sie sich von der Wirklichkeit machen, in denen sie aber doch eigentlich nur sich selbst kennen und nicht die Welt" (p. 212). Johannes Klein's remark in his *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle* that "keine Gestalt von der andern wirklich etwas weiss" (p. 202) is also false.

Here, in a work of art, where a symbol is intended to signify that isolation is the lot of man, we are told of slaters, of human beings, who have contact with each other, who do not suffer from any form of isolation. Considering the description of the family in Cologne, it can hardly be claimed that isolation is a condition common to slaters, let alone to man in general. This is an example of a contradiction within the structure of the novel between an interest in the particular and the individual (isolation as the distinguishing characteristic of the members of the Nettenmair family in contrast to other families and other people where there is no isolation) and an interest in the general and the typical (the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde ist des Schieferdeckers Reich" signifying that isolation is the lot of man).

IV

This same contradiction between the individual and the typical is also present in Ludwig's remarks about the characters in his novel. In the draft of a letter, presumably to Eduard Devrient, Ludwig states that he intended to show how each individual directs his own particular life, creates his own special heaven and hell.[51]

---

[51] Ludwig's conception that man controls the course of his own life is basic to his whole literary and aesthetic works. Albert Meyer writes of the central position this idea assumes in Ludwig's aesthetics of the drama: "In der Wirklichkeitssphäre der menschlichen Natur wirkt vor allem das ihr und nur ihr wesenseigene Prinzip der Freiheit des Willens, der Freiheit der Selbstbestimmung. Der hier vorwaltende Grundsatz lautet: 'Dem Menschen steht die Wahl offen, und sein Schicksal hängt an seiner Wahl' [Stern, V, 54]. Dieser Satz legt das Fundament der eigentlichen Ethik. Er wird sich von höchster Tragweite erweisen in der Auffassung des Schicksals und des Tragischen, das Problem der Schuld wird sich erst aus dieser Voraussetzung fassen und lösen lassen. Der Mensch bestimmt sich selbst sein Schicksal – dies ist seine moralische Freiheit" (*Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs*, p. 21). – In her

> Meine Intention war, zu zeigen, wie jeder Mensch seinen Himmel sich fertig mache und seine Hölle, d.h. *seinen* Himmel. Ich zeigte in zwei Menschen die Extreme, zwischen denen es tausend Nuancen gibt, in deren Mitte das absolute Ideal liegt. Der Tod des Bruders wäre für hundert andere ein Glück gewesen, für ihn [Apollonius] ist es keins. Seine zu grosse Gewissenhaftigkeit ist nah daran, ebenso sein Verderben zu werden, als die Gewissenlosigkeit die des Bruders wurde. Er hat sich zuletzt seinen Himmel geschmiedet, *seinen*. Sie und ich beneiden ihn nicht um diesen Himmel; uns wär' er keiner, ihm ist er einer; wie unser Himmel ihm keiner sein würde.[52]

> Sie [Devrient?] werden dem Apollonius *seinen* Himmel so wenig beneiden oder sich denselben wünschen als ich; nichtsdestoweniger ist er *sein* Himmel.[53]

> Der leitende Gedanke meines Buches ist: Jeder Mensch schafft sich sein Schicksal, seinen Himmel selbst, wohlverstanden aber: eben nur den seinen. . . . Wer einen Himmel wie Apollonius haben will, der handle wie er.[54]

Despite this extreme emphasis on the individual and particular nature of Apollonius, Ludwig writes in the very same letter that Apollonius and Fritz are types. "Fritz und Apollonius sind zwei Typen der Äussersten der Menschheit, . . . der Frivole und der Ängstliche, und der eine immer frivoler, der andere immer ängstlicher; das Ideal liegt in der Mitte zwischen beiden." [55] Ludwig also wrote in a letter to Berthold Auerbach that he portrayed psychological types in the novel: ". . . das führt mich dahin, ein eigentlich dramatisches Element, die psychologische Entwickelung der Charaktere und zwar psychologischer Typen in die erzählende Gattung einzuschwärzen." [56] Apart from noting the contradiction in Ludwig's comments here concerning Apollonius as

---

dissertation, "Morphologische Untersuchungen an Otto Ludwigs Erzählung *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", Ursula Kerrinnis states of Ludwig's novel: "Diese Begebenheit der Entscheidung schlechthin ist als die zugrundeliegende Idee der Erzählung zu bezeichnen" (p. 104). We agree that the characters determine the course of their own lives, but not that this is the central idea of the novel.

[52] Merker, III, xxi-xxii.

[53] Merker, III, xx.

[54] Merker, III, xviii.

[55] Merker, III, xix.

[56] Stern, VI, 448.

an individual and then as a typical character,[57] it must also be asked what ideal can lie midway between Apollonius and Fritz. *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* does not suggest an ideal of human nature as, for example, Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris* does by the actions and decisions of the heroine. Moreover, are Apollonius and Fritz such extreme opposites as Ludwig claims? Is not the characteristic they have in common, their isolation, most important of all? They both develop differently in the course of the novel due to their isolation, but they both share this basic characteristic nevertheless.[58] Thus Fritz and Apollonius are neither "grundverschieden" [59] and thereby typical representatives of extremes of humanity, nor are they, although they share an important basic characteristic, typical examples of their common characteristic, of their isolation. Each, as we have shown and as Ludwig does not tire of insisting in his letter to Devrient, develops from this basic similarity in his own particular and individual way.[60] Fritz ends in insanity and Apollonius leads the life of a bachelor and a respected, but lonely bourgeois.

---

[57] The characters in Ludwig's main works are not types. Fritz Martini writes of *Der Erbförster*: "Was er [Ludwig] als Tragisches im *Erbförster* gestalten wollte, ist lediglich auf die psychologische Besonderheit der einen Figur reduziert; auf das Ineinander von Rechtlichkeit und Verblendung, das diesen Förster masslos macht, ..." *(Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, 196-197).

[58] Brinkmann perceives a common characteristic (p. 210). He, however, also accepts Ludwig's description of Fritz and Apollonius as extremes and types (pp. 201-202), even though he later on writes: "... in jedem Betracht muss es Ludwig auf das Besondere, Individuelle als solches ankommen" (p. 227).

[59] Oskar Walzel fails to perceive the motif of isolation in self and claims that Fritz and Apollonius are "grundverschieden" *(Die deutsche Literatur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart*, 63). Ludwig's view of his two characters as complete opposites has, indeed, been accepted unquestioningly by his critics: "... diese fundamentale Verschiedenheit der Charaktere" [of Fritz and Apollonius] (R. Müller-Ems, 28); "Ludwig gestaltete die Schicksale zweier völlig gegensätzlicher Charaktere. Um die stärkste Wirkung zu erzielen, lässt er sie Brüder sein" (Besch, 20); "In character Fritz and Apollonius are diametrically opposed" (De Jong, 194); "Die Brüder sind völlig entgegengesetzte Naturen, ..." (Forest, 25). McClain (p. 64) and Weigand (pp. 386-387, 400) incline towards the interpretation of Fritz and Apollonius as complete opposites, as does also Witte (pp. 69, 74-75, 183). Griessmann's acceptance of the absolute polarity of the two brothers causes him to see polarity as the dominant formal principle of the novel (pp. 221ff.). His main evidence is that there are, supposedly, two "Räume" where the action takes place in each section from the fourth section on when, according to Griessmann, the conflict and opposition between the brothers begins. This is, however, a vast oversimplification and Griessmann is forced into extraordinary illogic to maintain his point of view. Since he sees the first three sections as containing no opposition between the two brothers, he must limit the action to one single place in each section. Unfortunately, for example, the action of the third section takes place in the Nettenmair house and in a ballroom. Since the ball scene, however, occurs between two scenes in the Nettenmair house, Griessmann maintains that it is enclosed ("umschlossen", p. 225) by the house and therefore

The influence of the aesthetics of German Classicism, shown here in Ludwig's attempts to characterize his novel by speaking of types and an ideal, is dominant also throughout his own literary aesthetics.[61] Waltraut Leuschner-Meschke gives the following summary of Ludwig's conception of the artist's task: "Seine Aufgabe ist, die Regel, den typischen Fall oder – wie Ludwig es gern ausdrückt – den stilisierten Weltlauf darzustellen. Hierin muss das Schicksal ein typisches sein. Darunter versteht Ludwig, dass im Schicksal der Person das Allgemeine des menschlichen Loses ausgedrückt werden soll; das bedingt, dass auch der Held ein Typus ist. Folglich muss auch die Darstellung, die Behandlung des Stoffes typisch sein." [62] This is the direct opposite of Ludwig's artistic presentation of his characters and treatment of his material in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. Apollonius is not a type and his development is not typical but peculiar to his own particular na-

---

we can speak of really only one "Raum"! When in section eight, however, Griessmann needs two places to maintain his argument, he does not hesitate to oppose the "Stube" in the Nettenmair house to Fritz's "Schenke". The difference between "Stube" and "Schenke" on the one hand and the similarity between house and ballroom on the other is one which escapes this critic. Since sections six and seven, fourteen and fifteen each have only one place of action, Griessmann combines them and considers them together to support his interpretation! Griessmann does not perceive the main point, namely, that the events of one "Raum" are not different from those of another. All "Räume" are scenes for the one continuous development and course of action in the novel.

[60] Arthur Kracke sees Fritz as a type in a way we have not considered, as "der typische Gründersohn" (p. 19). Kracke gives, however, little supporting argument and it is difficult to see that Fritz's squandering of money etc. in the manner of a *nouveau-riche* is so dominant in his character as to postulate him as typically a "Gründersohn".

[61] This has often been emphasized by Ludwig's critics, e.g. Albert Meyer, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs*, 184; Fritz Martini, *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, 2, 202-203, 204, etc.; Waltraut Leuschner-Meschke, "Aus Otto Ludwigs Kunstauffassung", *Worte und Werte. Bruno Markwardt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1961), 200ff.

[62] "Aus Otto Ludwigs Kunstauffassung", 206.

ture. His decision not to marry Christiane and the reasons for this are by no means typical, as Ludwig insists at first in the letter to Devrient.

Fritz Martini thus characterizes Ludwig's position very well, when he writes: "Sein Ziel, den Widerspruch zwischen ... Allgemeinem und Individuellem, Gesetzhaftem und Zufälligem ... auszugleichen, schloss die Aufgabe ein, zur Stileinheit zu bringen, was gerade die Form des Romans als innerer Zwiespalt bedrohte." [63] Although there are admirable artistic features in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, e.g., the weaving of the leitmotifs, the handling of the narrative points of view, the intense psychological investigation of character, our analysis of the title as symbol in relation to the novel as a whole has shown that Ludwig was here unable to realize artistically the aim Martini outlines above, that he was unable, in his last novel, to reconcile the general with the particular.[64]

[63] *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, 396.

[64] It is thus obvious that we consider the lavish praise accorded Ludwig by some critics to be unjustified. In his book, *Otto Ludwig als Thüringer in seinem Leben und seinen Werken* (Halle a. d. S., 1913), Wilhelm Greiner does Ludwig rather a disservice by his extravagant remarks in regard to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*: "So schaltet der Dichter auf der einsamen Höhe seiner Kunst in der machtvollen Freiheit des Genies mit allen grossen Mitteln des göttlichen Handwerks. ... Die besten Kenner empfanden sogleich, dass hier ein ewiges Meisterwerk deutscher Dichtung geschaffen war, ..." (p. 140). It is more just to Ludwig if the critic acknowledges both his merits and his failings. The attempt to glorify him as almost a second Goethe came mainly from German critics writing shortly before or during the two World Wars. They used Ludwig and his works for their cult of "Heimat" and "Vaterland". Greiner concludes his above-quoted study as follows: "An einem kalten Wintermorgen, am 28. Februar 1865, ward der Dichter auf dem Trinitatiskirchhofe zur ewigen Ruhe bestattet. ... Der Ort aber soll jedem Thüringer heilig sein; denn der hier ruht, war einer der Grössten, die aus heimischem Stamm entsprossen, und er war treu dem geliebten Heimatboden bis zum letzten Atemzug" (p. 158). – Greiner was also editor of the *Otto-Ludwig-Kalender* (1929-1942). It is disappointing that the essays in this year-book are of an extremely low critical standard. Most space is devoted in the early volumes to an examination of Ludwig as "Heimatdichter", e.g., Wilhelm Greiner, "Die Poesie des Thüringer Waldes bei Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1929, 40ff.; Wilhelm Greiner, "Thüringische Einflüsse bei Goethe und Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1932, 33ff.; Bernhard Fischer, "Volksgestalten und Volkstümliches bei Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1931, 70ff. This cult of Ludwig became extreme during the Nazi period when such essays as the following were printed in the *Kalender*: Arthur Kracke, "Otto Ludwigs Bluterbe", *OLK*, 1935, 104ff.; Nikolaus Fey, "Otto Ludwig als nationaler Führer", *OLK*, 1931, 7ff.; Wilhelm Greiner, "Otto Ludwigs Wahrheitsfanatismus als Geisteserbe aus Stamm und Sippe", *OLK*, 1942,

In *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* there are, however, further attempts at the creation of symbols (as we shall show in the following chapter), and these are not only more successful, but also historically, of greater interest.

45ff. The fusion of the two tendencies to view Ludwig as a "Heimatdichter" and to use his works for National-Socialist propaganda is to be found in a most blatant form in an essay on *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*: Karl Kley, "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* und die Heimaterlebnisse Otto Ludwigs", *OLK*, 1940, 59-68. Examples from Kley's "Blut-und-Boden" analysis are the following: "Seine [Ludwigs] Werke sind von einer blutgebundenen Wahrheit, dass sie wie Ursagen wirken. Sie haben seit bald 90 Jahren nichts an Seelentiefe und Wirkung eingebüsst, weil der Dichter seine Gestalten aus dem Boden der Heimat und ihre Schicksale und Leidenschaften aus seinen eigenen Erinnerungen, ja aus seinem Blute entwickelte" (p. 60). "Das 'Heimatgefühl', das z.B. der Franzose gar nicht übersetzen kann, ist nicht nur für Otto Ludwig, sondern für alle wirklich deutschen Dichter und Denker Kennzeichen und Kraftquelle gewesen. Und Ludwigs Wort aus *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* 'Im Gedanken Heimat umarmen sich all unsre guten Engel' gilt nicht nur im Reiche der Poesie, sondern in unserem gesamten nationalen Leben. Der Ludwigsche Heimatgedanke hat allerdings mit sentimentaler, lokaler Schwärmerei nichts zu tun, sondern er ist im Sinne dieses urdeutschen Künstlers Voraussetzung, Prüfstein und Eingangspforte des Deutschen schlechthin" (p. 68).

CHAPTER VII

THE MOTIF OF ISOLATION IN THE LITERATURE OF THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

It has long been recognized by literary scholarship that isolation is an explicit and dominant motif in the whole of nineteenth and twentieth century European and American literature. The critical discussions of the motif and of the formal means employed to express it by various authors are numerous.[1] However, for the purposes of this study, three types of isolation must be distinguished. Firstly there is the *voluntary withdrawal* from the world or human society by the mystic, philosopher, Romantic, artist, etc. in order to commune more fully with himself, with nature and the divine. Walter Rehm connects this withdrawal in its emphasis on the individual with the Renaissance conception of man and shows it to extend back to Petrarca:

> Petrarca liebt und sucht die Einsamkeit als Quelle der inneren Sammlung und der Selbsterkenntnis, der Besinnung auf das eigene persönliche Ich; er will in der beschaulichen Zurückgezogenheit zu den Ursprüngen seines eigenen Wesens zurückfinden, er will ein innerweltliches Dasein mitten in der Hast des Tages sich bereiten, und er findet auf dem Wege der Selbsterkenntnis den Weg zu Gott, die Gotteserkenntnis. . . . Nicht alle dringen bis dahin vor, die meisten bleiben an ihrem Selbst haften, gerade auch Petrarca oft genug; denn dies Selbst war freilich ein Neues, Unbekanntes, kam einer Entdeckung in der eignen Seelenlandschaft und einem anderen,

---

[1] Works containing general discussions of its occurrence in different periods of literature are : Walter Rehm, "Der Dichter und die neue Einsamkeit", *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde*, XLV (1931), 545-565; Walter Höllerer, *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne* (Stuttgart, 1958); Fritz Martini, *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898* (Stuttgart, 1962); Walter Sokel, *The Writer in Extremis* (Stanford, 1959); F. N. Mennemeier, *Das Moderne Drama des Auslandes* (Düsseldorf, 1961); David Daiches, *The Novel and the Modern World* (Chicago, 1960).

> wesentlich weltlichen und oft qualvoll empfundenen Wert gleich. Hier lag das Neue gegenüber dem mittelalterlichen "eremitischen" Einsamkeitserlebnis und seiner asketisch-jenseitigen Form: dort suchte man nur Gott und achtete das Selbst nur als die Stätte, da Gott sich dem suchenden Menschen offenbart. Den Eigenwert dieses Selbst wollte Petrarca sich erkämpfen: er verlegt die Akzente, doch er verlängert nur den Weg, der auch ihn, durch die Welt hin, zu Gott zurückführt.[2]

The isolation described here is surrender of possible contact in one sphere, the human, for intensified exploration of self and communication with the divine.

The second type of isolation asserts that each human being lives, as W. H. Auden has expressed it, "in the cell of himself".[3] Contact and understanding are impossible even between people who remain constantly together in what one would assume are the closest human relationships, i.e., those between husband and wife, between members of the same family, between lovers and between friends. This is not isolation caused by voluntary withdrawal from human society, but by an inability to communicate with others considered inherent in human nature. Büchner introduces this motif most emphatically at the very beginning of *Dantons Tod*:

> JULIE: Glaubst du an mich?
>
> DANTON: Was weiss ich! Wir wissen wenig voneinander. Wir sind Dickhäuter, wir strecken die Hände nacheinander aus, aber est ist vergebliche Mühe, wir reiben nur das grobe Leder aneinander ab, – wir sind sehr einsam.
>
> JULIE: Du kennst mich, Danton.
>
> DANTON: Ja, was man so kennen heisst. Du hast dunkle Augen und lokkiges Haar und einen feinen Teint und sagst immer zu mir: lieber Georg! Aber (*er deutet ihr auf Stirn und Augen*) da, da, was liegt hinter dem? Geh, wir haben grobe Sinne. Einander kennen? Wir müssten uns die Schädeldecken aufbrechen und die Gedanken einander aus den Hirnfasern zerren.[4]

Danton believes that each person is trapped in self, that nobody really knows the other, only his external shell, that each lives past the other. This is, as we have shown, an exact description of the situation of the three male members of the Nettenmair family where each, as a leitmotif tells us of Apollonius, has not the slightest idea what is taking place in the other. Danton is, however, more conscious of his isolation than Herr Nettenmair, Fritz, and Apollonius are. He is able to formulate the problem quite precisely and perceptively, whereas the members of the Nettenmair family, even when they on occasion perceive their isolation, are never fully aware of its consequences, nor of its extent. They are thus also more thoroughly its victims.

---

[2] "Der Dichter und die neue Einsamkeit", 546.

[3] *Collected Shorter Poemes, 1930-1944* (London, 1959), 65.

[4] *Werke und Briefe* (Wiesbaden, 1958), 9.

Often connected with this second type of isolation is the third one: alienation from nature and the divine, the gulf between man and everything which lies beyond the human sphere. This was expressed in Ludwig's novel by the symbol of the clouds' passing and by certain occurrences of the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde".

The combination of the second and third above types of isolation represents the most radical confinement of man in self: his involuntary alienation from his fellow men, nature and the divine. We have shown in reference to the Nettenmair family that this is the major motif of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It arose in literature during the later part of the eighteenth century,[5] but did not become dominant until after the Romantic period. It has remained so to the present day. Amongst other critics, Walter Höllerer has discussed its presence, to varying degrees, in Grabbe, Büchner, Immermann, and Stifter.[6] Characteristic of the whole period which Martini calls "Bourgeois Realism" [7] and, it must be added, also of the literature since then are "drohende Vereinzelung im nur Subjektiven" [8] as well as the experience of expulsion from nature: "Dem Verlangen nach einer im Gefühl verbürgten Einheit von Naturhaftem und Menschlichem trat die Erfahrung der Gespaltenheit des kosmischen Naturreiches und der menschlichen Existenz als getrennte Bereiche gegenüber, zwischen denen sich keine Brücke schlagen liess. . . . Die Natur stand dem Menschen fremd, stumm, gleichgültig gegenüber; sie antwortete nicht mehr seinem Fühlen, sondern liess ihn mit sich allein." [9] Benno von Wiese remarks that modern civilization has led to the radical isolation of the individual and finds consequences in this for the form of the drama: "Gerade die Entwicklung des modernen Dramas zeigt seit Hebbel in wachsendem Masse die Unmöglichkeit der Verständigung. Die dramatische Form löst sich dort auf, wo nicht mehr zugehört wird und die Menschen aneinander vorbeireden." [10] In *The Writer in Extremis*, Walter Sokel has traced the motif of isolation throughout Expressionist literature. He finds the philosophical foundations of modern art in general and Expressionism in particular in Kant and also notes: "Even the Romantics, though in many ways close to modernism, still believed in the ultimate union between man and nature. They still refused to accept the whole lesson of Kant, which spells inexorable estrangement between man and nature, a lesson that most moderns have learned by heart whether they have read Kant or not." [11] In *The Novel and the Modern World*, David Daiches insists that the motif of isolation in self is the dominant one in the novel of the twentieth century. He writes: "Throughout all these novelists [Joseph Conrad, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and D. H. Lawrence] the question 'How is love possible in a world of individuals imprisoned by their own private and unique consciousness?' is asked and probed in a great variety of ways. Loneliness is the great reality. . . ." [12] F. N. Mennemeier claims in *Das Moderne Drama des Auslandes* that isolation (as we have defined it in regard to *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*) is the basic theme of the "Theatre of the Absurd".[13] Mennemeier's argument is easily supported by remarks of the dramatists themselves. Arthur Adamov has commented: "Um die Unordnung unserer Welt auf die Bühne zu bringen, habe ich nicht versucht, ihre Ursachen aufzuzeigen, sondern ich wollte ihre Ergebnisse schildern, deren merkwürdigstes die Einsamkeit mitten im Lärm der Menge ist. Die Menschen zwar durch alle möglichen Interessen miteinander verbunden, haben dennoch keine Möglichkeit zur gegenseitigen Verständigung." [14] Samuel Beckett has remarked in

---

[5] Rehm, 548ff.

[6] Höllerer, 63-64, 108, 113, 128-129, 140-141, 231-232, 234, etc.

[7] *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898.*

[8] *Ibid.*, 15.

[9] *Ibid.*, 15.

---

[10] *Zwischen Utopie und Wirklichkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1963), 323.

[11] Sokel, 8.

[12] Daiches, 10.

[13] Mennemeier, 172.

[14] Quoted in the prospectus issued by the Luchterhand Verlag for the German translation of Adamov's plays. The firm was unable to give a more exact reference when asked where they obtained the quotation.

regard to the same phenomenon: "There is no communication, because there are no vehicles of communication." [15] Mennemeier also rightly points out that isolation in self is a major concept in Existentialist Philosophy and an important motif of what he calls the "Existential Theatre", i.e., mainly the dramas of Camus and Sartre.[16] These critical pronouncements could be supplemented by many more.

Most of the critics who have discussed isolation as a motif in literature have been concerned with its appearance in one author or one period and have, on occasion, ignored or even denied its occurrence almost everywhere else. David Daiches wishes to limit the motif almost exclusively to the novel of the twentieth century. He writes: ". . . only one major earlier novelist, Laurence Sterne, was concerned with loneliness and love in the modern sense. . . ." [17] Walter Höllerer justifiably extends Benno von Wiese's statement about the effect of the motif of isolation on the form of dramatic dialogue to include Grabbe: "Es wäre zu ergänzen, dass schon vor Hebbel, im Drama Grabbes, diese Entwicklung vorweggenommen wird. . . . Auch Günter Jahn kommt bei der Untersuchung des Dialogs im Drama Grabbes zu der Feststellung, es vollziehe sich 'weder innere Begegnung noch Ausgleich und Synthese der Gegensätze, sondern schärfste Kontrastierung'. Jahn geht den Veränderungen im Verlaufe des Entwicklungsganges der Grabbeschen Dramenreihe nach; *diesen* Punkt aber, die Vereinzelung in der Redeform, findet auch er von den frühen Stücken bis zur Hermannsschlacht durchgehend vor." [18] It could be further stated that Büchner's dramatic dialogue also presupposes this development, as Höllerer later shows,[19] but does not mention here.

The motif of isolation as it appears in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* must, therefore, be seen not as a characteristic and major motif of one author or one period of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but as a dominant and explicit motif of the whole of Post-Romantic literature.

---

[15] Quoted by Mennemeier, 304.

[16] *Ibid.*, 173.

[17] Daiches, 11.

[18] Höllerer (p. 25). He is referring to Günter Jahn's Göttingen dissertation, "Übermensch, Mensch und Zeit in den Dramen Christian Dietrich Grabbes" (1950), 25.

[19] Pp. 115ff.

The following discussion of certain images and symbols which are employed in Romantic literature to express the unity of man, nature, and the divine, but in Post-Romantic literature, including *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, to express man's radical isolation will offer further evidence for this view.

1. THE SYMBOL OF THE CLOUDS' PASSING

Ludwig employs the symbol of the clouds' indifferent passing in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* to suggest that man has no contact with any sphere beyond the human. When Fritz falls to his death, we read: "Aber oben hoch die Wolken am Himmel achten es nicht und gehen unberührt darüber hin weiter ihren grossen Gang. Sie sehen des selbstgeschaffenen Elends so viel unter sich, dass das einzelne sie nicht bewegen kann." [20] Georg Büchner and two poets of the twentieth century, Joseph Weinheber and Wallace Stevens, employ this same symbol of the clouds' passing, as Ludwig does, to suggest the gulf between man and everything beyond the human sphere. There may, no doubt, be further employment of the symbol in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which has escaped our notice. However, its occurrence in the works of Büchner, Ludwig, Weinheber, and Stevens demonstrates a certain relationship and similarity in motif and image throughout Post-Romantic literature. This also applies to the following discussion of the symbol of the blue sky.

At the end of *Dantons Tod*, Lucile, the wife of Camille Desmoulins, is overcome by the realization of her husband's death. She is convinced the world must now stop in its course, as her husband's life has stopped. "Es regt sich alles, die Uhren gehen, die Glocken schlagen, die Leute laufen, das Wasser rinnt, und so alles weiter bis da, dahin – nein, es darf nicht geschehen, nein, ich will mich auf den Boden setzen und schreien, dass erschrocken alles stehn bleibt, alles stockt, sich nichts mehr regt." [21] Lucile sits down, closes her eyes and then screams. Nothing has changed. Everything about her continues indifferently on its normal way, like the clouds moving continually across the sky. "Das hilft nichts, da ist noch alles wie sonst; die Häuser, die

---

[20] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 248.

[21] *Werke und Briefe*, 81.

Gasse, der Wind geht, die Wolken ziehen. - Wir müssen's wohl leiden." [22] The inability of man to affect the rhythm of existence in his surroundings, the gulf between them, horrifies Lucile and she intentionally and openly declares herself a royalist. By so doing, she accepts death as a way out of a life which has become meaningless for her.

In Part One, characteristically entitled "Einsame Seele", of *Der dunkle Weg* by Josef Weinheber, the poet considers what would change were he to die. He reaches the conclusion that his death, like Fritz's death, would alter nothing in any sphere beyond the human. Death is for man an end. It is for him "absolute and without memorial", as we shall see in the Stevens' poem. Everything else, however, continues, like the clouds, unaffected on its way.

> Und was wird anders, wenn ich nicht mehr bin?
> Die Wolken ziehen und die Blumen spriessen,
> Die Brunnen rauschen und die Jahre fliessen,
> Und keines weiss von Ende und Beginn. . . .[23]

Here there is the same conception, as in Ludwig's novel and Büchner's drama, of a world which moves continually on its way not sharing in and untouched by man's suffering and transience. Man is excluded from the movement and rhythm of existence in his surroundings. One of the images Weinheber chooses to illustrate this is the continual passing of the clouds. Ludwig contents himself with this one, same image.

In his poem, "Death of a Soldier", Wallace Stevens writes of the finality of death and of man's lack of contact with any domain which sympathizes with his death.

> Life contracts and death is expected,
> As in a season of autumn.
> The soldier falls.
> He does not become a three-days personage,
> Imposing his separation,
> Calling for pomp.
> Death is absolute and without memorial, . . .[24]

---

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] Joseph Weinheber, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Josef Nadler and Hedwig Weinheber (Salzburg, 1953), I, 230.

[24] *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens* (London, 1955), 97.

The two final stanzas of the poem compare the death of the soldier, and the complete inability of this to create any lasting impression, with the stopping of the wind, which, however, does not have any effect on the movement of the clouds.

> Death is absolute and without memorial,
> As in a season of autumn,
> When the wind stops,
> When the wind stops and, over the heavens,
> The clouds go, nevertheless,
> In their direction.[25]

The death of a soldier causes change in no sphere. Everything beyond the soldier is indifferent to his death. His death has no more importance for and no more influence on the world of human beings or any other world than has the wind on the larger movement of the clouds. Everything is as indifferent to and as unaffected by the soldier's death as the clouds are indifferent to and unaffected by the stopping of the wind. The soldier dies, his life stops as the wind stops in autumn, everything else moves, like the clouds, indifferently on. There is here the same isolation of man from his surroundings as in Büchner's, Ludwig's, and Weinheber's use of the symbol of the clouds' passing.

In a discussion of Berthold Brecht's poem "Erinnerung an die Marie A.", Albrecht Schöne has pointed out that Brecht's cloud image employed there is an old symbol of transience: "Allein die 'Wolke', die nur für Augenblicke am Himmel stand, die im Winde dahinschwand, schon als er aufsah, dies Allervergänglichste besteht in der Erinnerung des Sprechenden und in der Dauer des Gedichts. Nubes, nubicula - das uralte Vergänglichkeitssymbol, dessen transibit durch die Zeiten erklingt, . . ." [26] The cloud symbol of the four writers considered above, however, endows the motion of the clouds with a different significance, for their constant passing is interpreted as an eternal, unchanging movement and not as something fleeting which reflects the transience of man's own life and experiences, ". . . die Vergänglichkeit, das Dahinschwinden, welches den Menschen betrifft, wie die Wolke".[27] In the examples discussed above, it is only man who is subject to change, only the rhythm of *man's* existence which can be stopped. The contrast between the indifferent, eternal movement of the clouds and the transcience of man for whom "death is absolute and without memorial" expresses the gulf between man and everything beyond him, gives the old symbol a new significance.

---

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Die Deutsche Lyrik, Form und Geschichte*, ed. B. von Wiese (Düsseldorf, 1957), II, 490.

The Romantic poet, Novalis, however, employs the clouds to suggest the very opposite of what Büchner, Ludwig, Weinheber, and Stevens intend. In *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*, the hero says to Sylvester:

> "So ist die Kindheit in der Tiefe [as symbolized by the flowers] zunächst an der Erde, da hingegen die Wolken vielleicht die Erscheinung der zweiten, höhern Kindheit, des wiedergefundnen Paradieses sind, und darum so wohltätig auf die Erstere heruntertauen."
>
> "Es ist gewiss etwas sehr Geheimnisvolles in den Wolken," sagte Sylvester, "und eine gewisse Bewölkung hat oft einen ganz wunderbaren Einfluss auf uns. Sie ziehn und wollen uns mit ihrem kühlen Schatten auf und davon nehmen und wenn ihre Bildung lieblich und bunt, wie ein ausgehauchter Wunsch unsers Innern ist, so ist auch ihre Klarheit, das herrliche Licht, was dann auf Erden herrscht, wie die Vorbedeutung einer unbekannten, unsäglichen Herrlichkeit."[28]

Here the clouds do not suggest man's isolation, but foreshadow the approaching golden age. When they pass on their way, they wish to take man with them. There is no indifference expressed by their movement, but a desire for union. They also try to comfort man, to cool him with their shade.

Sylvester continues that the clouds can also be threatening to man with their thunder and lightning, that they can cover up the joyful blue of the heavens. Heinrich, however, interprets this favorably: " 'Es sind Nachhalle der alten unmenschlichen Natur, aber auch weckende Stimmen der höhern Natur, des himmlischen Gewissens in uns.' "[29] Even the threatening character of the clouds is seen as a manifestation of the transcendental sphere, a call to arouse man's own divine conscience, and the nature of which the clouds are messengers is, by contrast with its former state, "menschlich". Here there is union, or at least the possibility of union, not the certainty of isolation. There is no trace of indifference as in Büchner's, Ludwig's, Weinheber's, and Stevens' use of the symbol.[30]

---

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Schriften*, I, 330.

[29] *Ibid.*

2. THE SYMBOL OF THE BLUE SKY

There is another image which acquires symbolic force and suggests, in Romantic literature, the communion of man with his surroundings, his feeling of oneness with the entire universe, but in Post-Romantic literature man's radical isolation. This is the frequently mentioned *blue sky*. It occurs at first merely as one detail amongst many, but gradually, in Post-Romantic literature, it comes to be used on its own as a symbol of isolation. In Romantic literature, its calm blue is pervaded by the same spirit of divine tranquillity or joy which man also feels. In Post-Romantic literature, however, the blue sky stands for the indifference of man's surroundings to the suffering within him, to the hardships and catastrophes of his existence. Just as the clouds pass on their usual way unaffected by the death of Fritz Nettenmair in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, of Camille Desmoulins in *Dantons Tod*, of the poet in Weinheber's poem, and of the soldier in Stevens', so the sky remains an unchanging, tranquil blue in the face of human disaster. This lack of sympathy towards man in his surroundings symbolizes the gulf between them.

I

In Wordsworth's poem, "Tintern Abbey", the poet speaks of his relation to nature now that he is no longer a youth. He senses the divine power present in all creation.

> ... And I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,

---

[30] In his book *Wolkenbilder und Wolkengedichte der Romantik* (Berlin, 1960), Kurt Badt is concerned mainly with painting, but his discussion of cloud symbols from the Bible to Goethe and Wordsworth shows these to be expressive of man's connection with nature and the divine, not of his isolation from them.

> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of men:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.[31]

Here man and the blue sky are pervaded by the same "spirit" and the same "motion". They both commune with the divine and they are both subject to the same movement and rhythm of existence, "a motion . . . that impels . . . and rolls through all things". Man, nature, and the divine are in harmony with each other here.

In Brentano's poem "Heimatsgefühl", the poet is delighted and enraptured by the blue of the sky.

> Du himmlische Bläue!
> Du irdisches Grün!
> Voll Lieb und voll Treue,
> Wie wird mein Herz so kühn!
> . . . . . .
> Ihr himmlischen Fernen,
> Wie seid ihr mir nah!
> Ich griff nach den Sternen
> Hier aus der Wiege ja! [32]

The poet once more communes with nature and the divine. One detail which reveals this is his joy at the blue of the heavens which, though far away, are paradoxically near for him. As the title of the poem indicates, they are part of his home.

II

Turning to a consideration of the occurrences of the image of the blue sky in Post-Romantic literature, we find that it acquires the very opposite significance to the one it has in Wordsworth's and Brentano's poems. In Stifter's *Der Hochwald*, the characters are terrified by the smiling blue sky.

---

[31] *The Centuries' Poetry*, ed. Denys Kilham Roberts (Melbourne-London-Baltimore, 1954), III, 153.

[32] Clemens Brentano, *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Heinz Amelung and Karl Viëtor (Frankfurt a. M., 1923), I, 114-115.

> Mit diesem Worte schaute er [Gregor] in das Rohr, aber ob auch sein Auge durch Übung vielmal schärfer war, als das der Mädchen, so sah er doch auch nichts anders, als sie: in schöner Klarheit einen gewaltigen Turm von dem Waldrande emporstehen ohne Dach, und mit den schwarzen Brandflecken, nur schien es ihm, als schwebe noch eine ganz schwache blaue Dunstschicht über der Ruine. Es war ein unheimlicher Gedanke, dass in diesem Augenblicke dort vielleicht ein gewaltiges Kriegsgetümmel sei, und Taten geschehen, die ein Menschenherz zerreissen können; aber in der Grösse der Welt und des Waldes war der Turm selbst nur ein Punkt. Von Kriegsgetümmel ward man gar nichts inne, und nur die lächelnde schöne Ruhe stand am Himmel und über der ganzen Einöde.[33]

> Auch Johanna sah hindurch, um ihn nur gewöhnen zu können, den drohenden unheimlichen Anblick; denn sobald sie das Auge wegwendete, und den schönen blauen Waldduft sah, wie sonst, und den lieblichen blauen Würfel, wie sonst, und den lachenden blauen Himmel gar so prangend, so war es ihr, als könne es ja ganz und gar nicht möglich sein. . . .[34]

The sky remains a joyful blue although a catastrophe, as is later certain, has occurred in the human sphere and, moreover, a catastrophe which, as the narrator comments, can tear human hearts to shreds with the magnitude of the pain and suffering it will cause. Johanna is unable to comprehend this indifference of the blue sky, for she expects man's surroundings to be in sympathy with him. They are here, however, no longer permeated by the same spirit which bound them together in Wordsworth's poem. The sky is a distant, inhuman domain and by no means Johanna's home as it was for the poet in Brentano's "Heimatsgefühl". The separation of man from everything beyond the human sphere is expressed here by the smiling blue sky in the face of human disaster. The sky remains its usual, indifferent blue in *Der Hochwald* just as the clouds pass unaffected on their usual way in *Zwischen Himmel* und *Erde*, in *Dantons Tod*, and in Weinheber's and Stevens' poems, although in each case human beings have suffered death.

---

[33] Adalbert Stifter, *Studien*, ed. Max Stefl (Augsburg, 1955), I, 287.
[34] *Ibid.*, 288-289.

In Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, there is a similar situation to that in Stifter's *Der Hochwald*. When M. Rouault receives the letter telling him that his daughter, Emma Bovary, is dead, he sets off on his horse at breakneck speed for the village where she lived. He is unable to believe that the information can be true. If it were, he reasons, there would be some sign. "... et, d'ailleurs, si elle était morte, on le saurait? Mais non! la campagne n'avait rien d'extraordinaire: le ciel était bleu, les arbres se balançaient; un troupeau de moutons passa." [35] There is no indication of death in the world about M. Rouault. The sky is its normal blue, calm and harmonious and not indicative of a catastrophe. M. Rouault cannot believe in the death of his daughter because he, like Johanna in *Der Hochwald*, expects man's surroundings to mirror his fate, to be in sympathy with him. They both cannot comprehend this indifference to man and his lot as once more suggested by the description of the blue sky in the face of human suffering.

The image of the blue sky occurs on another similar occasion in *Madame Bovary*. It is again one of the details which suggest the gulf between man and his surroundings in the description of Charles Bovary's death.

> Le lendemain, Charles alla s'asseoir sur le banc, dans la tonnelle. Des jours passaient par le trellis; les feuilles de vigne dessinaient leurs ombres sur le sable, le jasmin embaumait, le ciel était bleu, des cantharides bourdonnaient autour des lis en fleur, et Charles suffoquait comme un adolescent sous les vagues effluves amoureux qui gonflaient son cœur chagrin.
>
> A sept heures, la petite Berthe, qui ne l'avait pas vu de toute l'après-midi, vint le chercher pour dîner....
>
> – Papa, viens donc! dit-elle.
>
> Et, croyant qu'il voulait jouer, elle le poussa doucement. Il tomba par terre. Il était mort.[36]

Hugo Friedrich has perceived the isolation of the characters in Flaubert's novels, although not the part played by the frequently described blue sky in expressing this, and has made the following important observations: "In Flauberts späten Romanen war die Kontaktstörung zum Gesetz des inneren wie äusseren Stils geworden; die Dinge verhalten sich konträr zum Menschen: leidet er, so leuchten und blühen sie, . . ." [37] "Die Dinge verdichten nicht nur diese Beziehungslosigkeit. Ihr Schmutz oder ihre Schönheit stehen jeweils im umgekehrten Verhältnis zur Stimmung des Menschen, in dessen Bezirk sie treten. Es braucht dies nicht einmal in feindseliger Form zu sein. Die blosse Gleichgültigkeit ist noch schlimmer." [38]

---

[35] Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary* (Paris, 1958), 311.

[36] *Ibid.*, 323-324.

III

The blue sky as one detail in the following description from *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* has the same expressive power as it does in the above passages from *Der Hochwald* and *Madame Bovary*. The description is that of Fritz and his father on the steeple of St. Georg.

> Es war ein Abend voll Gottesfriedens. Tief unten weit hingedehnt die grüne Erde; oben hoch der Himmel, wie ein Kelch aus blauem Krystall darüber gedeckt. Kleine rosige Wölkchen wie Flocken hineingestreut. Der Lärm von unten erlosch immer mehr. . . . Hoch am Himmel und tief auf der Erde, überall Gottesfrieden und süss aufgelöstes Hinsehnen nach Ruhe. Nur zwischen Himmel und Erde die beiden Menschen auf dem Kirchdach zu Sankt Georg fühlen nicht seine Flügel. Nur über sie vermag er nichts. In dem einen brennt der Wahnsinn überreizten Ehrgefühls, in dem andern alle Flammen, alle Qualen der Hölle.[39]

In the preceding chapter, this passage was interpreted in regard to the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde" to show the isolation expressed there. The description of the blue sky is also indicative of this. The sky is crystal blue, one detail expressive of the divine calm which pervades the scene. The human beings, Herr Nettenmair and Fritz, are, however, consumed by the torments of their emotions. The turmoil within them is in direct contrast to the divine calm of the blue sky and their other surroundings. The separation of man from everything beyond the human sphere is expressed by this contrast. The significance which the description of the blue sky acquires, its divine tranquillity in the face of human suffering and despair (the exact opposite of the situation in "Tintern Abbey" where the spirit of the divine pervades all things, and dwells in "the blue sky, and the mind of men") and the significance of the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde" here both reveal the important fact that it is impossible to talk of communion with nature and the divine in Ludwig's novel.[40] In his essay, "Der Einklang von Natur und Mensch in der äusseren

---

[37] Hugo Friedrich, *Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik* (Hamburg, 1960), 126.

[38] Hugo Friedrich, *Drei Klassiker des franzözischen Romans* (Frankfurt a. M., 1961), 151.

[39] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 204. The two other mentions of the blue sky in the novel do not refer to the world of nature but to the inner world of the characters. The image is used firstly as part of a joyful inner landscape expressing Christiane's reawakened love (p. 120) and, secondly, as an image indictating a supposed improvement of the situation in the Nettenmair house (p. 260), a lack of "Wolken" (cf., chapter VI, note 11).

---

[40] In his essay, "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXVIII (1946), 385-402, Hermann J. Weigand interprets the various chance happenings in Ludwig's novel as indicative of "das Walten einer übernatürlichen, ethisch orientierten Macht. . .. das Walten des christlichen Gottes . . ." (p. 402). (Martini repeats this view in *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898*, p .467, giving Weigand as his authority, p. 883, note 348.) The consequence of this is that Weigand characterizes Apollonius as "ein Auserwählter . . .. der unter der besonderen Obhut Gottes steht und in allen Fahrlichkeiten von unsichtbarer Hand behütet wird" (p. 402). It is difficult, however to reconcile this interpretation with the motif of isolation in the novel. Ludwig's employment of chance happenings here seems rather to come from his old habit, evident in almost all his prose works, of introducing these to solve the problems of the plot. Almost all critics from Richard Müller-Ems (pp. 19ff.) to W. H. McClain (pp. 9, 19) have recognized this. Relevant here are also McClain's remarks in regard to the lack of concern with the divine in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (*Between Real and Ideal*, p. 63). – Weigand also writes: "Wo aber der vielfach gefährdete Mensch durch ein solches Spiel engverzahnter Begebenheiten wiederholt bis an den Rand des Untergangs geführt wird, um im letzten Augenblick gerettet zu werden, da sind wir seit alters her gewohnt, die Hand der Vorsehung zu erblicken" (p. 402). This introduction of providence Weigand interprets as Ludwig's bowing to the demands of his reading public. "In der Führung der Fabel . . . akkomodiert er [Ludwig] sich ganz den Voraussetzungen und Erwartungen jener christlich-bürgerlichen Mittelschicht, die um die verborgenen Wege der Vorsehung recht genau Bescheid weiss" (p. 402). If Apollonius is "saved" by and is the chosen child of a christian, bourgeois, divine providence, why then does he not marry Christiane? Why is he not "saved" from his isolation at the end? Surely nothing could be more contrary to a christian, bourgeois conception of a beneficent, divine providence than this rejection of marriage, this rejection of a hallowed christian, bourgeois institution – as is shown, moreover, by the surprised reaction of some of Ludwig's christian, bourgeois readers that Apollonius does *not* marry Christiane. (Cf. Paul Heyse's letter to Ludwig reprinted in: *Ludwigs Werke*, ed. Arthur Eloesser, II, 8.)

Gestalt der Werke Otto Ludwigs",[41] Fritz Tiemann shows the use which Ludwig makes of nature descriptions in his plays and early "Novellen" to be Romantic "Stimmungsmalerei".[42] Tiemann is, however, unable to grasp the function of the nature descriptions in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. He insists on a harmony between man and nature throughout all of Ludwig's works. Where the description of nature has symbolical force, it is, according to Tiemann, expressive of this harmony.[43] The motif of isolation is not perceived and Tiemann thus completely misses the significance of the presentation of the gulf between man and nature revealed in the description of Fritz and his father on the steeple of St. Georg, a description in which the symbol "zwischen Himmel und Erde" and the portrayal of the calm, blue sky in the face of human suffering are expressive of man's isolation This passage is discussed by Tiemann and he realizes that there is here a different situation to those in Ludwig's earlier prose works, but he does not draw any consequences from this, merely finding the description "erschütternd" and "unerwartet".[44] Indeed, Walter Silz seems to be the only critic who has perceived the special attitude to nature evinced in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and revealed most clearly in the description of Fritz and his father on the steeple of St. Georg. In his essay, "Nature in the tales of Otto Ludwig",[45] Silz writes of Ludwig's "final emancipation from the traditions of the Romanticists" [46] in his portrayal of nature in his last novel. However, Silz, like Tiemann, fails to perceive the full significance of the presentation of the contrast between tormented man and calm nature, between the hell in the minds of Herr Nettenmair and Fritz and the divine calm in the crystal blue sky. Silz does not connect the passage with the motif of isolation, but sees it merely as an example of Ludwig's achievement of dramatic effect. "Sometimes the contrast of nature emphasizes the meaning of the action", Silz writes of the description of Fritz and his father on the steeple of St. Georg. What meaning? is a fair question here, but Silz merely continues: "Thus the dreadful colloquy of Fritz and his father is set against a peaceful evening landscape." [47] To fail to perceive the motif of isolation and the meaning of the description of the calm blue sky is not to recognize the historical significance of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, the connections between its symbols and images and those employed throughout Post-Romantic literature, as we have shown already in regard to the symbol of the clouds' passing and shall further show in regard to the image of the blue sky.

---

[41] *OLK*, 1933, 54-63.

[42] *Ibid.*, 54.

[43] *Ibid.*, 54.

[44] *Ibid.*, 58.

[45] *MLN*, XLI (1926), 8-13.

[46] *Ibid.*, 13.

IV

In the literature of the later nineteenth and early twentieth century, the blue sky comes to stand for a distant and indifferent domain which cannot be reached by man. In "Tristesse d'été", Mallarmé writes of "l'insensibilité de l'azur et des pierres" [48] and, in "L'Azur", he further chooses the blue sky as the symbol of an unattainable ideal of art and beauty which tortures the poet.

---

[47] *Ibid.*, 13. In *Otto Ludwigs Erzählungskunst* (Berlin, 1905), Richard Müller-Ems also contents himself with remarking that there is a "mächtige Kontrastwirkung" in the description of Fritz, his father and their surroundings (p. 64). – Griessmann (p. 189) denies with Berkhout (p. 141) the symbolic nature of the landscapes, even also of the slater's trade between heaven and earth. Griessmann quotes Berkhout's statement: ". . . die Landschaft . . . ist nicht Anknüpfungspunkt für allgemeine Betrachtungen, oder Symbol. Sie ist eine weltanschaulich und stimmungsmässig unbeschwerte Landschaft", and continues: "Selbst jenes scheinbar um seiner selbst willen ausgeführte Bild von der Arbeit eines Schieferdeckers, von seinem Werkzeug, seinem Handwerk, seinem Wagemut usw. fällt aus diesem Rahmen der reinen Handlungsräume nicht heraus" (p. 189). Our analysis of the symbolic significance of the title and of the blue sky disproves Berkhout's and Griessmann's assertions. Griessmann sees with Besch (p. 25) the progress of the repairs of St. Georg as "Gleichnis", *not* as symbol (Griessmann, p. 196), for the inner development of the characters. Besch writes: "In dem Masse, wie die Arbeiten auf St. Georg fortschreiten, verdichtet sich die unheilvolle Stimmung im Schieferdeckerhaus in einer geraden Entwicklung bis zur Katastrophe" (p. 26). This parallelism seems, however, false. Both Besch and Griessmann actually fail to take into serious consideration that the repairs and the inner development of the characters move in opposite directions. The condition of St. Georg is gradually improved by the repairs, whereas the inner state of the characters becomes gradually worse and more endangered. Apollonius' difficult resignation at the end of the novel can hardly be considered similar to the successful completion of the repairs of St. Georg. The repairs appear entirely in a positive light, whereas Apollonius' decision is resignation in the face of an insurmountable difficulty. Indeed, the only parallel seems to be that in both cases there is a conclusion to a course of action. Brinkmann (p. 203) also failed to see this.

[48] Stéphane Mallarmé, *Vers et Prose*, ed. Henry Mondor (Paris, 1961), 75.

> De l'éternel Azur la sereine ironie
> Accable, belle indolemment comme les fleurs,
> Le poète impuissant qui maudit son génie
> A travers un désert stérile de Douleurs.[49]

Baudelaire had similarly selected the azure sky as the residence of his ideal of beauty, which is once more impossible of attainment. The voice of beauty in "La Beauté" says: "Je trône dans l'azur comme un sphinx incompris." [50]

Following in this tradition, Rudolf Alexander Schröder makes the blue sky the slate upon which the divine revelation is written. It is, however, impossible for man to interpret this golden script when it is in the blue sky.

> Goldne Schrift am Firmament,
> Ach, wer deutet uns im Blauen,
> Das wir nur durch Tränen schauen,
> Was so fern, so selig brennt,
> Goldne Schrift am Firmament? [51]

For these three poets, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and Schröder, the blue sky represents a domain which is beyond the reach of man, a domain which is unintelligible for him and which regards him with the ironic and indifferent gaze of the sphinx. It is no longer near and it is not his home, as it was for Brentano.

This conception pervades the poetry of the twentieth century. The image of the blue sky recurs to a surprising degree in the work of European and American poets. Giuseppe Ungaretti writes in his poem "Apollo": "L'azzurro inospite è alto." [52] In another poem, characteristically entitled "Solitudine", Ungaretti tells of his vain cries to a deaf heaven.

---

[49] *Ibid.*, 66.

[50] Charles Baudelaire *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Y. G. leDantec (Tours, 1958), 96.

[51] *Deutsche Gedichte*, ed. Theodor Echtermeyer and Benno von Wiese (Düsseldorf, 1961), "In der Nacht gesungen", 629.

[52] Quoted by Edgar Lohner in *Passion und Intellekt* (Berlin, 1961), 218.

Ma le mie urla
feriscono
come fulmini
la campana fioca
del cielo
Sprofondano
impaurite[53]

The blue of the sky, it is true, is not specifically mentioned in the above poem, but it is in Albert Ehrenstein's poem, "Aber Hagel wird unter dem Himmel", where Ehrenstein uses the same image as Ungaretti to convey his isolation.

Nicht mehr fleh ich betend
Die Hände empor zu den heiligen Türmen,
Lautauf drohe ich schon
Dem blauhinhallenden Himmel.[54]

Ungaretti's cries and Ehrenstein's threats both echo from a deaf and indifferent blue sky. Human distress finds no sympathy here as in the passages from the works of all the other writers discussed above. In another poem, "Über dem roten Tollmond", Ehrenstein tells of his acceptance of isolation and that the blue of the sky can no longer be his home. This is the exact opposite of the situation in Brentano's "Heimatsgefühl".

Allein
Auf der Dunkel strahlenden Erde
Sehn ich mich nur noch: zu wandern.

. . . .

Mich hält kein Seligen-Himmel, kein Blau mehr, . . .[55]

Reminiscent of the situation in *Der Hochwald*, Josef Weinheber writes of the horror which is aroused in him by the reflection of the blue sky in the pools of rain around a grave.

Niemals seither
war ich an deinem Grabe mehr.
Mir graut

---

[53] *Gedichte* (Suhrkamp Verlag, 1961), 72.
[54] Albert Ehrenstein, *Gedichte und Prosa* (Berlin, 1961), 46.
[55] *Ibid.*, 240-241.

vor diesem kleinen, gelbbraunen Hügel,
um den die Regenlachen stehen,
flüssige Spiegel,
in denen ein höhnend verlogener Himmel blaut.[56]

The horror is aroused in the poet here and the sky is mocking and deceitful because it had seemed to promise sympathy with man. Instead it remains its usual blue. It seems, indeed, to blossom into this blue ("blaut") even over a human grave. There is also no common spirit which pervades this sky and man, as there was for Wordsworth.

For Louis MacNeice, too, the blue sky is a symbol of the lack of sympathy for man of everything beyond the human sphere, of the isolation of man from his surroundings. In "Refugees", MacNeice gives this advice:

. . . Something-or-Other
Becomes an expected angel from the sky.
But do not trust the sky, the blue that looks so candid
Is non-commital, frigid as a harlot's eye.[57]

Finally, in his poem, "Sunday Morning", the American poet, Wallace Stevens, employing solely the image of the blue sky, tells explicitly of man's isolation, an isolation which most of the other poets and novelists discussed here have been content to suggest by this image combined with others or used on its own. The woman in Stevens' poem dreams of a future paradise:

The sky will be much friendlier then than now,
A part of labor and a part of pain,
And next in glory to enduring love,
Not this dividing and indifferent blue.[58]

All these Post-Romantic writers and poets, Stifter, Flaubert, Ludwig, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, R. A. Schröder, Ungaretti, Albert Ehrenstein, Weinheber, MacNeice, and Stevens, choose, independently of each other, the same image of the "dividing and indifferent blue" sky, at first as one detail amongst many and then gradually by itself, to express man's radical isolation, his lack of contact with any domain which sympathizes with him and his lot.

---

[56] *Sämtliche Werke*, I, 365.

[57] Louis MacNeice, *Poems 1925-1940* (New York, 1940), 292.

[58] *Collected Poems*, 68.

By this examination of the symbols of the clouds' passing and of the blue sky, we have attempted to show that the motif of isolation in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, and some of the artistic means Ludwig employs to express this, place his novel in a European and American tradition which extends throughout Post-Romantic literature up to the middle of the twentieth century, a tradition which connects Ludwig's novel in its dominant motif and symbols with works of, amongst others, Büchner, Stifter, Flaubert, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Albert Ehrenstein, Guiseppe Ungaretti, Wallace Stevens, and Louis MacNeice. It is indeed a striking fact that a major poet of the twentieth century such as Wallace Stevens, who most probably did not know Ludwig's works, should be concerned with the same motif as Ludwig in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and should choose the same symbols of the clouds' passing and of the "dividing and indifferent blue" sky to express it. This is a significant proof of the continuing importance of the motif of isolation and also of a relationship of Ludwig's last novel to modern literature.[59] The following discussion of Ludwig's method of narration will also seek to offer further evidence for this view.

---

[59] Fritz Martini would appear to support, somewhat hesitantly, this opinion. He regards Ludwig's psychological investigation of character in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, especially because this "streifte [!] an das Pathologische", as giving the novel "eine gewisse Modernität" (*Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898*, 468). In Ludwig's handling of narrative perspectives Martini finds "eine, wenn auch künstlerisch nicht bewältigte Modernität Ludwigs . . ." (*Forschungsbericht zur deutschen Literatur in der Zeit des Realismus*, 9, note 15). Here would also belong Martini's statement, which we shall consider in detail in the next chapter, "Er [Ludwig] förderte die analytische Technik des psychologischen Erzählens bis zum Experiment des inneren Monologs" (*Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus 1848-1898*, 468).

CHAPTER VIII

OTTO LUDWIG'S METHOD OF NARRATION

Several critics have maintained that Ludwig employed in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* the narrative techniques of *erlebte Rede* and the inner monologue, techniques which are usually associated with the modern psychological novel. The critical discussions of the matter, however, suffer from a failure to define terms. We propose to reconsider the problem here, beginning with an attempt at defining *erlebte Rede* and inner monologue.[1]

I

The term inner monologue was coined by the French critic, Valéry Larbaud, to describe a particular feature of James Joyce's method of narration in *Ulysses*.[2] Joyce himself, however, drew Larbaud's attention to the fact that the inner monologue of *Ulysses* was not new, that he had learned this narrative technique from a nineteenth century novel, *Les lauriers sont coupés* (1887) by Edouard Dujardin. In his biography of Joyce, Richard Ellmann reports: "He [Joyce] also discussed with Larbaud the method of what Larbaud, borrowing a term from

---

[1] This chapter is indebted to the following works: especially Robert Humphrey, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959); René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1956), 212-215; Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* (Bern, 1959), chaps. VII-XX; Walter Höllerer, *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne* (Stuttgart, 1958); Leon Edel, *The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950* (London, 1955).

[2] James Joyce, *Ulysses* (London, 1960).

Paul Bourget's *Cosmopolis* (1893) called the '*monologue intérieur*'. Joyce remarked that the form had been employed, and in a sustained way, by Edouard Dujardin in *Les lauriers sont coupés*; 'in that book', he said, 'the reader finds himself established, from the first lines, in the thought of the principal personage, and the uninterrupted unrolling ("déroulement ininterrompu") of that thought, replacing the usual form of narrative, conveys to us what this personage is doing or what is happening to him.' . . . Joyce was determined to have Dujardin's work recognized, and at the beginning of 1923 brought *Les Lauriers* to Larbaud: 'Read it, you will see what it is.' Larbaud was convinced and soon began to persuade his incredulous countrymen that Dujardin, whom they considered merely a relic of the symbolist movement, was in fact the inaugurator of the latest literature." [3] In *Le monologue intérieur*,[4] Dujardin stressed the very same characteristics of this narrative technique as James Joyce and Valéry Larbaud did: the emphasis on the inner worlds of the characters and the absence of the omniscient author-narrator. Dujardin defines: ". . . le monologue intérieur . . . est un discours du personnage mis en scène et a pour objet de nous introduire directement dans la vie intérieure de ce personnage, sans que l'auteur intervienne par des explications ou des commentaires." [5] The emphasis on the inner worlds of the characters and the disappearance of the omniscient author-narrator in the novel both gradually took place during the nineteenth century.[6] The inner monologue would seem, according to the practice and the theory of the first writers who used it and the first critics who discussed it, to be the culmination of these two trends.

---

[3] Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (New York, 1959), 534-535.

[4] Edouard Dujardin, *Le monologue intérieur* (Paris, 1931). Brinkmann attempts to confine the inner monologue to the twentieth century and ignores *Les lauriers sont coupés*. He refers to Dujardin's novel only in a footnote which makes it appear as though the significance of the work were a discovery of Erich Kahler's in an essay published in 1953: "Untergang und Übergang der epischen Kunstform", *Die Neue Rundschau*, 64 (1953), 1-44. Brinkmann writes: "Kahler macht übrigens auf einen Vorläufer dieser Form der Erzählung im 19. Jahrhundert aufmerksam. Es ist Edouard Dujardins *Les lauriers sont coupés*" (p. 327, n. 2). Dujardin's *Le monologue intérieur* is included by Brinkmann in his bibliography (p. 342). One is tempted to draw the conclusion, however, that Brinkmann has not devoted much attention to this work since, had he done so, he would not have needed to refer to Kahler in order to discover the existence of *Les lauriers sont coupés*. From *Le monologue intérieur* he would also have discovered the central connection of Dujardin's novel with the origin and significance of the term inner monologue. Kahler merely writes: "Immerhin hat Joyce sich davon [*Les lauriers sont coupés*] anregen lassen" (p. 34).

[5] *Le monologue intérieur*, 5.

For our purposes here, however, the inner monologue must be defined further in its formal features. The inner monologue presents a character's thoughts in the first person and usually the present tense. It contains no comment which could make the reader aware of an omniscient author-narrator. The narrator merely describes what cannot be rendered conveniently in the character's thoughts, i.e., he gives "stage directions". The inner monologue further presents the character's thoughts *directly* to the reader without the author's intervention with "he thought", "she considered", etc. and without inverted commas or similar punctuation signs which always remind the reader that he is being told the character's thought indirectly by a narrator. This latter fact is emphasized by Leon Edel [7] and H. A. Kelly in his essay, "Consciousness in the Monologues of *Ulysses*",[8] where he writes: "No introductory tags are used to mark off the direct stream of consciousness, which often breaks in on the narrator quite abruptly." [9] As an example of the inner monologue, let us consider this passage from *Ulysses*:

> Stephen bent forward and peered at the mirror held out to him, cleft by a crooked crack, hair on end. As he and others see me. Who chose this face for me? This dogsbody to rid of vermin. It asks me too.[10]

The first half of the first sentence of the passage is a description by the author of Stephen's actions: "Stephen bent forward and peered at the mirror held out to him . . . ." "Cleft by a crooked crack" may still be author description of the mirror, but "hair on end" can only be explained as Stephen's comment on himself as he sees his reflection. Indeed, "cleft by a crooked crack, hair on end" seems better interpreted as Stephen's comments on the mirror and himself as he observes himself in it. Midway in the sentence, then, the point of view of the narration changes to that of Stephen. The next four sentences are also clearly Stephen's inner monologue: "As he and others see me. Who chose this face for me? This dogsbody to rid of vermin. It asks me too." Without any indication that it is going to do so, e.g., by the insertion of "Stephen thought" or of inverted commas or of any other similar punctuation signs, the passage suddenly becomes the direct first person presentation of Stephen's thoughts.

---

[6] Cf. *Mimesis*, chaps. XIX and XX; *The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950*, 133. Among others, Flaubert, Taine, and Henry James advocated the abandonment of the omniscient narrator in the novel, cf. George J. Becker, *Documents of Modern Literary Realism* (Princeton, 1963), 94-95, and Henry James, *The Art of the Novel* (New York, 1950), 328. For a general discussion cf. *Theory of Literature*, 212-215, and René Wellek's *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven, 1963), 246ff.

[7] *The Psychological Novel, 1900-1950*, 16-17.

[8] H. A. Kelly, "Consciousness in the Monologues of *Ulysses*", *MLQ*, XXIV (1963), 3-12.

[9] *Ibid.*, 5.

[10] *Ulysses*, 5.

Another example of the inner monologue can be found a few pages further on in *Ulysses*. The first two sentences are author description:

> A cloud began to cover the sun slowly, shadowing the bay in deeper green. It lay behind him [Stephen], a bowl of bitter waters.[11]

After this description of external details, this setting of the scene, Stephen's voice assumes the narrative. Without any introduction the passage suddenly becomes Stephen's thoughts about his mother's death.

> Fergus' song: I sang it alone in the house, holding down the long dark chords. Her door was open: she wanted to hear my music. Silent with awe and pity I went to her bedside. She was crying in her wretched bed. For those words, Stephen: love's bitter mystery.[12]

To be distinguished from the inner monologue is *erlebte Rede*.[13] This narrative technique differs from the inner monologue in that it may reproduce spoken words as well as thoughts, is written in the third person and generally in the past tense, i.e., the original first person and present tense of the character's actual thoughts and words have been transposed by the narrator. The reader is thus still made somewhat aware of the author's presence as narrator, as mediator, in *erlebte Rede*. It is also important to note that the thoughts of a character presented in *erlebte Rede* are in language and on a style level in keeping with his nature. This further distinguishes it from simple narrative.[14] *Erlebte Rede* has been shown to be present in the works of nineteenth-century writers, e.g., Büchner [15] and Balzac,[16] but by no means to the same extent as in the novels of the twentieth century.[17] We shall therefore take our examples once again from *Ulysses.* Almost the whole of the Nausicaä episode of Joyce's novel is narrated in *erlebte Rede.* It is the episode which concerns the flirtation at a distance of Gerty MacDowell and Leopold Bloom. The reader enters the consciousness of Gerty from whose point of view the episode is presented. Gerty is sitting on a rock near the seashore. Below her on the beach are her friends playing and on a nearby bridge is Bloom watching her.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, 9.

[12] *Ibid.*, 9-10.

[13] For the origin and long history of the term, cf. *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne,* 423-424, n. 72.

> Three and eleven she [Gerty] paid for those stockings in Sparrow's of George's street on the Tuesday, no the Monday before Easter and there wasn't a brack on them and that was what he was looking at, transparent, and not at her [Cissy's, Gerty's friend's] insignificant ones that had neither shape nor form (the cheek of her!) because he had eyes in his head to see the difference for himself.[18]

This might at first appear to be narrative by the author. However, the thoughts here are characterized by being in the language of a fanciful young girl and "the material reflects the content of such a person's conciousness".[19] This is "far more direct representation" [20] than simple author description of Gerty's thoughts. These thoughts are, however, not presented as directly as in the inner monologue. The author has changed the first person of what would be the girl's inner monologue into the third person. Thus *erlebte Rede* represents a combination of the author's and the character's voices. As Walter

---

[14] Erich Auerbach especially emphasizes this feature of *erlebte Rede*, *Mimesis*, 452.

[15] *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne*, 131-132.

[16] *Mimesis*, 440.

[17] *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne*, 424, n. 72; Etienne Lorck, *Die Erlebte Rede* (Heidelberg, 1921); compare Balzac's occasional use of *erlebte Rede* in *Le père Goriot* with Virginia Woolf's extensive employment of it in *To the Lighthouse.*

[18] *Ulysses*, 468.

[19] Robert Humphrey, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*, 31, who also comments on this passage from *Ulysses.*

[20] *Ibid.*, 31.

Höllerer says of this technique in Büchner's *Lenz*: "Er [the narrator] nistet sich in seiner Dichtung und in dem Kopf seines eigenen Geschöpfes so ein, dass zeitweise Autor und Geschöpf ganz nahe zusammenrücken." [21]

There is a further narrative form which is obviously related to the inner monologue and to *erlebte Rede*. To which of these it should be ascribed is, however, not clear. Höllerer regards it as a form of *erlebte Rede*. "Diese Form tritt in Augenblicken der höchsten Steigerung und grösster Erlebnisintensität in Erscheinung. Lenz 'sprach, er sang, er rezitierte Stellen aus Shakespeare, er griff nach allem, was sein Blut sonst hatte rascher fliessen machen, er versuchte alles, aber – kalt! Er musste dann hinaus ins Freie . . .' Kalt, kalt! ist ein Ausruf, ein Gedanke, eine Rede Lenzens im Bericht Büchners. Aber der Dichter erlebt diesen Ausruf selbst mit, als ob er in Lenz wohne, und so erscheinen die Worte ohne Übergang in der berichtenden Aussage. Der blosse Bericht würde lauten: 'er versuchte alles; aber sein Blut blieb kalt.' Die Darstellung in direkter Rede: 'er versuchte alles, aber er fühlte: Mein Blut bleibt kalt.' " [22] The difficulty in ascribing such short exclamations and interpolations to the inner monologue or to *erlebte Rede* is caused by their lack of an indication of person and tense. Similar examples to that above from *Lenz* can be found in *Ulysses*. Buck Mulligan is speaking to Stephen after linking his arm in Stephen's.

> "God, Kinch [Stephen], if you and I could only work together we might do something for the island. Hellenise it."
>
> Cranly's arm. His arm.
>
> "And to think of your having to beg from these swine. I'm the only one that knows what you are." [23]

The reader may well be puzzled by the four words which suddenly interrupt Mulligan's remarks to Stephen: "Cranly's arm. His arm." Who is Cranly? No character of this name has appeared in the novel. Indeed, to whom are we to ascribe these four words: to the author as comment, to Buck Mulligan, to Stephen? The solution of this problem is only possible when we have read Joyce's earlier novel, *A Portrait of*

---

[21] *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne*, 131.

[22] *Ibid.*, 132.

[23] *Ulysses*, 6.

the Artist as a Young Man.[24] Towards the end of this novel, the main character, who is also Stephen Dedalus, goes for a walk with his friend Cranly. Cranly takes Stephen by the arm: "Cranly seized his arm and steered him round so as to lead back towards Lesson Park. He laughed almost slyly and pressed Stephen's arm with an elder's affection." [25] It is this incident of which Stephen is reminded when Buck Mulligan takes his arm in *Ulysses*. The similarity of the situation impresses itself upon Stephen: "Cranly's arms. His [Buck Mulligan's] arm." These words, then, are the direct record of Stephen's spontaneous thought unintroduced by the narrator. It is, however, not possible to say conclusively whether they are *erlebte Rede* or inner monologue because all indication of person and tense, in reference to the speaker, is lacking.

II

In *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Ludwig has retained the unconcealed comment of the omniscient author, e.g., he writes of Fritz: "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" [26] On other occasions Ludwig narrates the story as an observer who knows no more than the characters do. Richard Brinkmann's detailed and subtle analysis in *Wirklichkeit und Illusion* has established these and other features of Ludwig's method of narration. The use of *erlebte Rede* has also been shown by Brinkmann to be extensive in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. It is however, a flaw in this excellent study that Brinkmann makes no attempt to distinguish between *erlebte Rede* and inner monologue. These terms have, after all, to do with the method of narration and are most important for an analysis of the structure of the novel. Brinkmann writes: "Wir lassen uns in allem Folgenden mit

---

[24] James Joyce, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York, 1960).

[25] *Ibid.*, 247.

[26] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 65. Thus Austin Warren's statement in *Theory of Literature*: "The opposite goal for the novel is the 'objective' or 'dramatic' method, argued for and illustrated by Otto Ludwig in Germany, . . ." (p. 213) is uncorrect insofar as the word "illustrated" is applied to Ludwig, for one of the "essentials" of the objective or dramatic novel is, according to Warren, "the voluntary absence from the novel of the 'omniscient novelist' " (p. 213).

Vorbedacht nicht auf die unabgeschlossenen Diskussionen über 'erlebte Rede', 'style indirect libre', 'monologue intérieur' usw. ein. Das führt uns hier nicht weiter. Vielmehr bedienen wir uns des Ausdrucks 'erlebte Rede' auch dann gelegentlich, wenn ein Fachmann mit einer entschiedenen Meinung über diese Dinge einen anderen Terminus für richtiger halten könnte." [27] It is difficult to see why a definition of and differentiation between these terms would not further a work of criticism which examines narrative methods in works of literature. The opinion that the discussion of the terms is still open should rather compel Brinkmann to attempt a definition of them, than make it unnecessary for him to do so. After all, the fact that the discussion of the term Realism was a very open one did not prevent him from attempting a definition of it.

The main difference between the inner monologue and *erlebte Rede* is, as was shown earlier in this chapter, whether the first or the third person is used. Admittedly, there exists, however, a perceptible tendency to make one term do the work of both. When the term chosen for this task is the inner monologue, there is, nevertheless, a marked inclination to qualify it in some way if it is used of passages not in the first person. Thus, in such cases, Dujardin uses the term "le monologue intérieur indirect" [28] and Hermann Broch, insisting that his novel *Der Tod des Vergil* is one long inner monologue, qualifies his statement in regard to the third person: "Obwohl in der dritten Person dargestellt, ist es ein innerer Monolog des Dichters [Vergil]." [29]

---

[27] *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 166, n. 1. Brinkmann's perception of extensive "erlebte Rede" in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* was not, however, new. Lutz Besch, for example, called attention to it in his 1943 essay, "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*" (p. 29), and Stuart Pratt Atkins broached the problem of the inner monologue when he wrote of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in 1939 that Ludwig here "... presents the thoughts of his characters in the third person as well as the first, so that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether one is reading narrative or the thoughts of a character. Recollections, imaginings and dreams are run together with the realities in the stream of consciousness of the characters in the novel" ("A Note on Fritz Nettenmair", *Monatshefte*, XXXI, 1939, 352). In her Göttingen dissertation, "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst" (1958), Elisabeth Witte undertakes an analysis of narrative perspectives in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* which is very similar to Brinkmann's study, but far less subtle and rewarding (pp. 17-59). Witte pays little attention to the conclusions Brinkmann draws from his analysis and even lists his book in her bibliography as *Illusion und Wirklichkeit* (p. 185)!

[28] *Le monologue intérieur*, 20.

By Brinkmann's failure to differentiate between *erlebte Rede* and inner monologue and his remark that there are perhaps passages which a specialist might consider as examples of the inner monologue, he *nolens volens* raises the question whether Ludwig employed in his novel another narrative device generally regarded as a characteristic feature of the psychological novel of the twentieth century. This question has been answered in the positive by Fritz Martini who writes: "Er [Ludwig] förderte die analytische Technik des psychologischen Erzählens bis zum Experiment des inneren Monologs." [30] It is important to note, however, that Martini refers to no example of the inner monologue in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and that he, moreover, like Brinkmann, turns to the Merker edition for his text of the novel. Where in the Merker edition is a passage which could be cited as an example of the inner monologue? The passages in Ludwig's three editions to which we drew attention, during the discussion of the text of the novel,[31] as containing possible examples of the inner monologue are so changed formally in the Merker edition – with its alteration of the sentence structure and insertion of inverted commas – as to be no different from the traditional method of narrating a character's thoughts employed, for example, by Goethe or Stendhal. These passages as they appear in the Merker Edition have no similarity with the examples of the inner monologue taken from *Ulysses*, the novel for which the term was formulated, nor, we must add, do any other passages of the Merker Edition.[32]

---

[29] Hermann Broch, *Gesammelte Werke. Essays I* (Zürich, 1955), 265.

[30] *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, 468.

[31] See Appendix B, "The Problem of a Correct Text".

[32] In a recent study, W. H. McClain also asserts that Ludwig employed the technique of the "interior monologue" in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. However, McClain's example of interior or inner monologue is by no means one. but merely traditional narration by the omniscient author of Apollonius' feelings when he returns to his home. McClain writes: "The technique which he [Ludwig] employs, however, is to alternate between direct narration and interior monologue. Thus the tears which fill the eyes of the returning traveler are described by Ludwig; but the young man's feeling that he would have wept, had he not felt ashamed, is his own feeling, as is his impression that his entire sojourn in Cologne has only been a dream. Because so much of what happens in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* goes on in the minds of the characters

The (M) passage[33] of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in its original form is especially interesting.

Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz. Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er [Fritz] ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm Alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wenn Er gehen müsste, Er! die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen. Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt, als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein, wie Alles, was einmal mein war! Sie ist in ihren Kleidern zu Bett gegangen; sie kann die Stunde nicht erwarten, wo ich

---

Ludwig uses the device of the interior monologue quite frequently in the story, and in every instance he uses it in combination with direct narration as he does here" (*Between Real and Ideal*, 59). The passage to which McClain refers is as follows: "Unserm jungen Wanderer drangen Tränen aus den ernsten und doch so freundlichen Augen. Schämte er sich nicht vor sich selbst, er hätte laut geweint. Er kam sich vor, als hätte er seinen Aufenthalt in der Fremde nur geträumt und nun, da er erwacht, könne er sich auf den Traum kaum mehr besinnen. Als hätte er nur geträumt, er sei ein Mann geworden in der Fremde . . ." (Merker, III, 9. This is the edition quoted by McClain. The Third Edition, p. 10, presents a different text, cf. Appendix B). Brinkmann sees this passage as a report: "Ganz deutlich ist jedenfalls: der Dichter hat die Anknüpfung an den Rahmen, an das 'Gedächtnis' des sinnenden alten Herrn im Gärtchen völlig beiseite gelassen. Er erzählt selbst in der Form der 'objektiven' Erzählung. Fremde Empfindungen, Gedanken und Eigenschaften erscheinen dementsprechend nur in der direkten Form des Berichtes . . ." (p. 172). All that McClain's use of the term interior monologue signifies is that the reader is not only presented with a narration of events, but also with the thoughts and feelings of the characters. That these are Apollonius' feelings is beyond doubt, but the manner in which they are narrated is *not* "monologue intérieur". McClain's use of the term, frequently found, is to be deplored, for the term interior or inner monologue has undeniable connections with the narrative technique of the modern psychological novel and to use it to describe a monologue or thoughts and feelings which take place within a character no matter how these are narrated, no matter what point of view is employed, is to use the term uncritically.

[33] See also Appendix B. The above objections to finding inner monologue in Merker's text refer especially to Witte's claim (p. 50) that the (M) passage as it appears there contains inner monologue. We are of the opinion that there are, as we shall try to show, several sentences of inner monologue in the *original* (M) passage but not in the distorted version of the Merker Edition. If the term is applied to the (M) passage of the Merker Edition, then we can find inner monologue in almost any novel.

gehe; und ginge Er, diese Rosen würden bleich, sie flösse sterbend in ihn hinüber, um nicht getrennt von ihm zu sein. Wie sie auffahren würde, sagt ihr einer in den Traum hinein, den sie von ihm träumt, denn sie lächelt, er geht! Er, ihr – Nein! ich will nicht gehen! Nein! ich kann nicht gehen. Lieber tausendmal sterben! Und er hat ja dem Tode schon ins Angesicht gesehen, . . .[34]

The narrative technique of the inner monologue always concentrates attention on what is taking place within a character, a domain mostly closed to the other characters, and evokes thereby a sense of the individual's imprisonment in self. The climax of Fritz's psychological development, his insanity, his complete loss of contact with the world about him, is presented in this (M) passage. Here Fritz falls a helpless prey to his *idée fixe*, imagining that Apollonius has intentionally robbed him of his wife's and his children's love. The passage begins with author description:

Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz.

There is then a change to *erlebte Rede*:

Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er [Fritz] ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wenn Er gehen müsste, Er! die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen.[35]

We know this is *erlebte Rede* and not author narrative of Fritz's thoughts by the staccato movement of the sentences and by the spacing and emphasis of certain words which reproduce Fritz's hysteria, his jolting thoughts as they race through his brain.[36] We also know that the above-quoted section of the (M) passage is not Fritz's inner monologue, because it is in the third and not the first person. If this were the inner monologue technique we would read: "Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr mein. Ich bin ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's . . ." The sentence of the (M) passage following directly after the *erlebte Rede* section is:

---

[34] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 239-240.

[35] *Ibid.*, 239.

[36] A further example of critical disregard for accuracy in textual matters, astonishingly prevalent in Ludwig-criticism, is to be found in a recent essay, "Syntactic Anomalies and Pronominal Ambiguity in Otto Ludwig's Narrative Prose", *MLR*, LX (1965), 65-72, by Gertrude Kolisko. Kolisko quotes the (M) passage of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and gives the Merker Edition as her reference (Kolisko, 69, n. 5). Apart from the incorrect wording of one sentence ("Er ist ihr Vater nicht" instead of "Er ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr")

> Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt, als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein, wie Alles, was einmal mein war!. .[37]

As in the examples of the inner monologue from *Ulysses*, the passage here has gone over into the first person of Fritz, has become the direct portrayal of Fritz's thoughts without any indication to the reader that such a change is about to take place. The emphasis on directness and immediacy in conveying Fritz's obsession in this passage is also shown by Ludwig's liberal use of spacing and capitals. Fritz's inner monologue continues for several sentences.

> Sie ist in ihren Kleidern zu Bett gegangen; sie kann die Stunde nicht erwarten, wo ich gehe; und ginge Er, diese Rosen würden bleich, sie flösse sterbend in ihn hinüber, um nicht getrennt von ihm zu sein. Wie

---

which may be a printer's error, Kolisko omits the inverted commas inserted by Merker. More serious, however, is Kolisko's speculation as to why certain pronouns in the (M) passage have been spaced *by Merker!* "Merker's edition has some of the pronouns in this passage – mostly, but not always, referring to Apollonius – spaced to indicate emphasis. Presumably, some aid to the reader was thought necessary" (p. 70). From an earlier remark (p. 66), however, it is apparent that Kolisko was acquainted at least with the First Edition and could, therefore, have discovered that the spacing was carried out by Ludwig himself – not to avoid an ambiguity in reference to Fritz or Apollonius which Kolisko attempts to find in the text here – but, as we have stated above, to show Fritz's obsession and hysteria, to create the effect of his jolting thoughts as they pass through his mind. – Contrary to Kolisko's opinion, it is psychologically and artistically justified, as in the (M) passage, that Fritz does not always refer to his brother by name. We are told at one stage in the story: "Er [Fritz] wusste nur noch, dass seine Frau ein 'Pimpeln' des 'Spions' zu einer Krankheit vergrössert hatte, um einen Vorwand zu erhalten, mit ihm [Apollonius] zusammen zu sein. Mit ihm! Nicht blos im Gespräch mit dem Gesellen, auch mit sich und seiner Frau nannte er Apollonius' Namen nicht; . . ." (p. 163).

[37] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 239.

sie auffahren würde, sagte ihr einer in den Traum hinein, den sie von ihm träumt, denn sie lächelt, er geht! Er, ihr – Nein! ich will nicht gehen! Nein! Ich kann nicht gehen! Lieber tausendmal sterben! [38]

Merker's unsatisfactory attempt to break the sentence structure and to insert inverted commas in this passage of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (a novel in which the author even goes to the extent of employing *double* inverted commas [39]) should discourage any attempt to treat the (M) passage as the traditional method of presenting a character's thoughts. This passage seems to presuppose the narrative technique of the inner monologue in its sudden change, without any indication by the narrator, to the character's point of view, to his unintroduced, uninterrupted and direct revelation of his thoughts. Fritz's thoughts here also have the same abrupt, staccato movement of the characters' thoughts in *Ulysses* but without, it must be admitted, the latter's flow of free association.[40] This would, however, be inappropriate in the (M) passage, because Fritz's mind has here seized on what he believes to be the sole cause of his misfortunes and this is the subject which completely obsesses him.

Not only the content but also the narrative technique employed in the (M) passage reveal Fritz's complete withdrawal into self. The gradual abandonment of the author's external, objective standpoint and the increasing presentation of the events from Fritz's subjective point of view in the changes from author description to *erlebte Rede* to inner monologue suggest Fritz's withdrawal into self, his loss of contact with the world outside of him, his final confinement in his narrow subjectivity.[41]

---

[38] *Ibid.*, 239-240.

[39] See Appendix B.

[40] As, for example, in Mrs. Bloom's famous inner monologue, *Ulysses*, 871ff.

[41] The above analysis of the artistic significance of the changes in narrative perspective in the climactic passage of the novel is intended to serve as a rebuttal of Brinkmann's view that the manipulation of narrative perspective is dictated not by aesthetic necessity, but rather by Ludwig's "Jagd nach Tatsachen" (*Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 195). This, Brinkmann's constantly recurring thesis is, however, never proven, as Fritz Martini has already pointed out (*Forschungsbericht zur deutschen Literatur in der Zeit des Realismus*, 11). It could indeed also be vividly shown elsewhere (e.g., in the ball scene) that the manipulation of the narrative perspectives, as well as of the leitmotifs etc.,

There are several examples in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* of the short exclamations and interpolations into the author narrative which were considered in the first section of this chapter. "Er [Fritz] wusste nur noch, dass seine Frau ein 'Pimpeln' des 'Spions' zu einer Krankheit vergrössert hatte, um einen Vorwand zu erhalten, mit ihm [Apollonius] zusammen zu sein. Mit ihm! Nicht blos im Gespräch mit dem Gesellen, auch mit sich und seiner Frau nannte er Apollonius' Namen nicht; . . ." [42] Fritz's exclamation "Mit ihm!" here is the same as Lenz's "Kalt! Kalt!" which bursts without any warning into the author narrative. In the following passage the unexpected exclamation is again Fritz's. It expresses his outburst of anger at Ännchen who is talking to Christiane on Apollonius' behalf. "Dann rauschte es einen Augenblick in den Blättern der Laube hinter ihr [Christiane]. . . . Hätte sie hingesehen, sie wäre entsetzt aufgesprungen von der Bank. Was die Blätter rauschen machte, war das stürmische Erzittern einer geballten Faust. Darüber stand ein rothes Gesicht, verzerrt von der Anstrengung, die die gehobene Faust zurückhielt, sonst hätte sie das lächelnde Gesicht des Kindes getroffen, das, so jung, schon eine Kupplerin war. Das lächelnde, vatermörderische Gesicht!" [43] This passage reveals once more the frequent changes in the point of view of the narration which take place in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*. The passage has already ceased to be pure author narrative before it reaches Fritz's exclamation, for the narrator does not think of Ännchenn as a "Kupplerin". This is Fritz's conviction. Already here the passage has changed to *erlebte Rede*.

The narrative method of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, then, com-

---

serves to stress the character's isolation in self by ironically contrasting their mostly subjective and false perspective with the narrator's constantly inserted objective and correct one. The narrator's ironic variation of Fritz's central leitmotif as "Wie Mancher meint die Welt zu kennen und kennt nur sich!" is one of the examples which most strikingly reveal the whole above-described artistic intention behind the variation and repetition of narrative perspective, leitmotif, etc. so characteristic of this novel. To censure Ludwig for "Mangel an Distanz" as Brinkmann does (p. 213) is also to fail to grasp the actual significance of the changes in narrative perspective, as Fritz Martini has suggested (*Forschungsbericht*, 8, n. 15).

[42] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, 163.

[43] *Ibid.*, 100. Cf. also p. 236ff.

bines the traditional techniques of the omniscient-author novel together with techniques of the modern psychological novel: the extensive use of *erlebte Rede* and, in at least one passage, what may be considered as an early form of the inner monologue.

APPENDIX A

A SYNOPSIS OF THE PLOT OF *ZWISCHEN HIMMEL UND ERDE*

Apollonius Nettenmair, one of the two sons in a family of slaters, loves a young girl, Christiane, who lives in the same small town. Fritz Nettenmair pretends to help his shy brother in winning Christiane's affections, but he actually attempts to gain her for himself by lying to her about Apollonius. Fritz tells his brother that he is having no success in interesting Christiane in him and suggests he go away, as this would be evidence that he was suffering from his love of her. The father, Herr Nettenmair, is tricked by Fritz into ordering Apollonius to go to their Cousin's family in Cologne. The Cousin is also a slater. While Apollonius is away, Fritz marries Christiane and takes over the management of the family business from his father who has, in the meantime, become almost blind. On receiving news of the marriage, Apollonius renounces his love for Christiane.

After approximately six years and at the bidding of his father, Apollonius returns home to help with the major task of repairing the steeple of St. Georg, the church of his birthplace. Apollonius finds everything completely foreign to him at home. Fritz seems to wish he would leave, Christiane avoids him, and his father remains, as usual, aloof. Fritz constantly imagines that Apollonius will rob him of Christiane and he endeavors, therefore, to keep them always apart. Apollonius wishes to clear up the difficult situation, but cannot because he is unaware of its causes.

Christiane gradually realizes that Apollonius is not the rogue her husband had pictured to her. When she accidentally discovers Apollonius' letters, she knows that Fritz has deceived her and her love for Apollonius reawakens.

In the meantime, Apollonius has become so disheartened by the attitude of his family that he decides to return to Cologne. Fritz rejoices at this news. However, Apollonius is prevented from leaving his home by the discovery that his brother's gambling and extravagances have almost bankrupted the family. Apollonius decides to remain and put things right.

Constantly tormented by his *idée fixe* that Apollonius and Christiane are deceiving or will deceive him, Fritz is indirectly responsible for his daughter's, Ännchen's, death. After this, Christiane does not even bother to pretend that she and Fritz have anything in common, refusing all attempts at reconciliation.

Gradually the idea of killing his brother becomes more and more enticing to Fritz, although (a sign of his approaching insanity) he believes he is being compelled to do this by Christiane and Apollonius. Fritz's first attempt to kill Apollonius by damaging his ropes fails because the "Geselle", whom Fritz had employed to watch his wife and brother, steals the ropes after he has been dismissed for dishonesty by Apollonius, and thereby finds his own death. On account of a confusion in the names of the villages (Brambach and Tambach) where Apollonius and the "Geselle" were working, the report of the death of a slater is interpreted as being that of Apollonius. When Herr Nettenmair hears of this, he sets out for the steeple of St. Georg where Fritz is attempting to escape his guilty thoughts in feverish activity. The father tells his son that, unless he commits suicide to save the family's honor, he will hurl Fritz and himself from the steeple. Before Fritz can make a choice, however, Herr Nettenmair learns that Apollonius is alive. He orders Fritz to leave the town forever.

When Christiane sees Apollonius after believing him dead, she rushes into his arms, confesses her love, and tells of Fritz's deception of them both. After an inner struggle, Apollonius suppresses the demands of his love for Christiane, since she is still his brother's wife.

Abandoned by all and tormented by his *idée fixe*, Fritz becomes insane and attacks his brother while he is working on the steeple of St. Georg. Apollonius saves himself and Fritz falls to his death.

Apollonius is tormented by guilt at his brother's death and at a possible marriage with his brother's wife. Each time he ascends the steeple of St. Georg, he is a prey to dizzy spells. The approaching marriage with Christiane, which is insisted upon by Herr Nettenmair, causes an intense conflict within Apollonius which he resolves by deciding not to marry. The decision is made by Apollonius before he ascends the steeple of St. Georg to extinguish a fire started there by lightning during a storm. After this decision, Apollonius regains his inner balance. He is now able to restore the family business to its former prosperity and lives the life of a respected, but lonely bourgeois.

APPENDIX B

THE PROBLEM OF A CORRECT TEXT

It would be expected that an editor, when preparing an edition of a poet's, dramatist's, or critic's works, would present the text of these works as it appeared in the manuscripts or in the editions which the author himself supervised. All changes in the text on the part of the editor should be accounted for in detail in the notes. Ideally, these changes should, moreover, be confined to a correction of obvious misprints. Even a modernization of spelling may disturb the intended rhythms, rhymes, and other effects dependent upon the sound of the words in their original form.

Lutz Besch,[1] who was concerned with the artistic structure of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, noticed variations in the section divisions of three posthumous editions of the novel.[2] He did not, however, inquire why such differences existed, but pursued his interpretation of the structure (a structure which he shows by reference to section divisions!) in the face of this confusion. Besch writes: "Obwohl alle drei Ausgaben in ihrer Kapitelanzahl und ihrer Druckanordnung voneinander abweichen, ergibt die Zusammenstellung [of the sections, which Besch prints above this quotation] ein anschauliches Bild des formalen Aufbaus." [3] Made curious as to why these differences should exist, we investigated the matter. When the editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* which Ludwig himself had supervised were compared with those published by various editors after his death, it was found that the latter had distorted the original text in its section divisions, punctuation, and even stylistic features without, moreover, recording the changes they had made.

---

[1] Lutz Besch, "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *GRM*, XXXI (1943), 19-30.

[2] Besch, 23. The editions he refers to are: *Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften*, I, ed. Adolf Stern (Leipzig, 1891); *Ludwigs Werke. Kritisch durchgesehene und erläuterte Ausgabe*, III, ed. Viktor Schweizer (Leipzig and Vienna, 1898); *Otto Ludwig. Sämtliche Werke*, III, ed. Paul Merker (Munich and Leipzig, 1914). These three editions will be respectively referred to as the Stern, Schweizer, and Merker Editions. References to these and other editions are to the volume containing *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* unless otherwise stated.

I

None of Ludwig's plans, outlines, and manuscripts of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* have survived,[4] but Ludwig himself prepared three editions of the novel: the First Edition in 1856,[5] the Second Edition in 1858,[6] and the Third Edition in 1862.[7] The text of the novel as it appears in the Second Edition differs, according to Paul Merker,[8] from the First Edition as follows: "Die . . . zweite verbesserte Auflage weisst *E* [First Edition] gegenüber zahlreiche und nicht unwesentliche Abweichungen auf. Neben stilistischen Verbesserungen ist vor allem die durchgehende, freilich nicht streng durchgeführte Tendenz zu beobachten, anstelle verkürzter und zusammengezogener Formen die schriftgemässen volleren Formen einzusetzen und den Anfang und das Ende von direkten Reden durch neue Absätze zu charakterisieren.

---

[3] Besch. 23. Elisabeth Witte also noticed these discrepancies, but likewise ignored them in her structural analysis ("Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", diss. Göttingen, 1958, p. 17).

[4] "Von dem Roman *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* aber ist in den gesamten, etwa zweihundertundfünfzig Heften des Nachlasses keine Spur einer Vorstudie oder Skizze zu finden" (Merker, III, vii. Cf. also III, 307).

[5] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Frankfurt a. M., 1856).

[6] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Frankfurt a. M., 1858).

[7] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Berlin, 1862).

[8] *Otto Ludwig. Sämtliche Werke*, unter Mitwirkung des Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs in Verbindung mit Hans Heinrich Borcherdt, Conrad Höfer, Julius Petersen, Expeditus Schmidt, Oskar Walzel herausgegeben von Paul Merker (Munich and Leipzig, 1912-1922). Only six volumes of the planned eighteen volumes of this edition were published.

Aus einer Reihe gleichlautender Druckfehler . . . geht hervor, dass Ludwig ein von ihm durchkorrigiertes Exemplar von *E* [First Edition] der neuen Auflage [Second Edition] zugrunde legte." [9] Merker has compiled a list of the corrections to which he refers here.[10] This list is generally reliable and almost complete. An example of a change in the division into paragraphs which Merker fails to indicate in his notes and to include in his text, although he explicitly states that this is based on the Second Edition,[11] is the following:

First Edition:

> Heut' noch schnürst du deinen Ranzen, hörst du? fuhr er ihn an. Apollonius sagte: Ja, Vater, Morgen mit Sonnenaufgang machst du dich auf die Reise.[12]

Second Edition:

> "Heut noch schnürst du deinen Ranzen, hörst du?" fuhr er ihn an. Apollonius sagte: "Ja, Vater."
>
> "Morgen mit Sonnenaufgang machst du dich auf die Reise." [13]

Merker Edition:

> "Heut noch schnürst du deinen Ranzen, hörst du?" fuhr er ihn an.
>
> Apollonius sagte: "Ja, Vater."
>
> "Morgen mit Sonnenaufgang machst du dich auf die Reise." [14]

There are, however, other changes from the First to the Second Edition which Merker fails to record. The First Edition is divided into twenty-three sections, the Second Edition into twenty-one sections. Ludwig omitted in the Second Edition the twelfth and twentieth section divisions of the First Edition.[15]

The problem of Ludwig's punctuation can also be illustrated by comparing the First and Second Editions. In the first four sections of the First Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, there are rarely inverted commas to indicate direct speech. An example of this is the following conversation between Apollonius and Fritz.

---

[9] Merker, III, 307-308.

[10] Merker, III, 308-330.

[11] Merker, III, 307.

[12] P. 23.

[13] Pp. 23-24. The paragraph division has obviously been introduced to separate Apollonius' words from those of his father.

[14] P. 17. Cf. also Second Edition, p. 8, Third Edition, p. 7, and Merker Edition, III, 7, for a further example.

[15] Cf. Table of Section Divisions on pp. 184-185 and compare First Edition, 166-167 and 259 with Second Edition, 170 and 263-264.

> Der Vater rief dich gestern in das Gärtchen –
>
> Ja und zog seine weissen Augenbrauen, die wie mit dem Lineal gemacht sind, anderthalb Zoll in die Höh'. Ich hatte mir's wohl gedacht. "Du gehst mit der Beate vom Einnehmer. Das hat aufgehört von heut' an."
>
> Ist's möglich? Und warum? [16]

From the fifth section on in the First Edition, however, Ludwig uses not only inverted commas to indicate direct speech, but also *double* inverted commas to distinguish the speakers.

> Der Bruder lachte. "Drum hast du den Abend deiner Heimkehr nur mit der Anne getanzt und sie heimgeleitet?" " "Mit deiner Frau hätt' ich getanzt" ", entgegnete Apollonius. " "Du warntest mich, deine Frau würde mir einen Korb geben, weil sie so unwillig auf mich war. Ich wollte nun gar nicht tanzen. Du brachtest mir die Anne und wie du gingst, fragtest du sie, ob ich sie heimbegleiten dürfte. Da konnt' ich nichte anders. Ich habe nicht daran gedacht, die Anne –" " "Zu heiraten?" lachte der Bruder. "Nun sie ist auch zum – Spasse hübsch genug und der Mühe wert, sie vernarrt in dich zu machen." " "Fritz!" " rief Apollonius unwillig. " "Aber es ist nicht dein Ernst" ", besänftigte er sich selbst.[17]

What is the reason for the omission of the inverted commas in the first four sections of the First Edition? Is this a mistake in printing or was Ludwig originally not concerned about them? If the latter is true, then he subsequently ascribed considerable importance to them, as his use of double inverted commas reveals.

The Second Edition has, throughout, inverted commas or double inverted commas around the direct speech [18] and, as Merker pointed out, also uses paragraph divisions to distinguish the speakers.[19] Passages where the words of the second speaker are not marked by double inverted commas prove to be misprints as a comparison of these passages in the First, Second, Third, and Freytag Editions will reveal.[20] As an example let us take the following from the Second and Third Editions.

---

[16] First Edition, 15.

[17] First Edition, 107-108.

[18] E.g., Second Edition, 94, 99-100, 109-110, etc.

[19] Compare First Edition, 173 with Second Edition, 176-177.

> Jetzt erhob sie [Ännchen] mit altkluger Ernsthaftigkeit das Köpfchen, sah die Mutter bedenklich an und sagte: "Was das nur ist?"
> " "Was?" " fragte die Mutter.
> "Wenn du da gewesen bist und fortgehst, sieht er dir so traurig nach."
> "Wer?" fragte die Mutter.
> "Nun, der Onkel Apollonius . . ." [21]

According to our rule, the "Wer?" in the above quotation, since it is the reply of the second speaker, should be placed between double inverted commas. That this is a misprint is proved by a comparison with the First Edition [22] and the Freytag Edition [23] in which the "Wer?" appears between double inverted commas.

It must, however, be added that the double inverted commas are mostly, but not always, used for the second speaker only if his words follow *immediately* upon the words of the first speaker and if the speakers are not clearly distinguished by being named. In the Second Edition we read:

> "Du suchst die Beate?" fragte unser Held, um seine Verlegenheit zu verbergen. "Nein", entgegnete der Bruder.[24]

Here no double inverted commas are placed around Fritz's reply because it does not follow immediately upon Apollonius' words and both speakers are clearly distinguished by the terms "Held" and "Bruder", constantly recurring appellations for Apollonius and Fritz throughout *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*.[25]

---

[20] *Otto Ludwig's gesammelte Werke*, ed. Gustav Freytag (Berlin, 1870). *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* forms the fourth volume. All references to this edition are entitled Freytag Edition and are to the fourth volume, unless stated otherwise.

[21] Second Edition, 90-91. Third Edition, 86.

[22] P. 90.

[23] P. 60.

[24] Second Edition, 14-15.

[25] Other examples: Second Edition, 27, 45, 102, 105, 116, 121, etc. Examples where there are double inverted commas even when the speakers are clearly named and the second speaker's words do not follow immediately, Second Edition, 113, 197.

A little further on after the above quotation we read:

> "Der Vater rief dich gestern in das Gärtchen –"
>
> " "Ja und zog seine weissen Augenbrauen, die wie mit dem Lineal gemacht sind, anderthalb Zoll in die Höh' . . . ." "[26]

The speaker's words follow immediately upon each other here and the double inverted commas are, therefore, placed around the second speaker's, in this case Fritz's, words.[27]

If a conversation between two speakers is interrupted somewhat by a descriptive passage, the double inverted commas may be placed around the words of the speaker who was originally the first speaker, but who, later, becomes the second speaker.

> "Du sollst sie allein haben, oder mit hinunter!" [Fritz]
>
> " "Fort!" " ruft der Bedrohte [Apollonius]. . . . Mit seiner ganzen Kraft stösst er mit der freien Hand den Drängenden zurück.
>
> "Zeigst du endlich dein wahres Gesicht?" höhnte dieser [Fritz] noch wüthender. "Von jeder Stelle hast du mich verdrängt, wo ich stand; nun ist die Reih an mir. . . . Wirf mich hinunter, oder du sollst mit!"
>
> Apollonius sieht keine Rettung. Die Hand erlahmt, mit der er sich nur mühsam anhält an der scharfen Kante des starken Balkens. Er muss den Bruder mit seiner ganzen Kraft an den Armen fassen, ihn herumdrehen und hinunterstürzen, oder der Bruder reisst ihn mit herunter. Doch ruft er: "Ich nicht!"
>
> " "Gut!" " stöhnt Jener. " "Ach das willst du auf mich wälzen! Auch dazu willst du mich bringen! . . ." " [28]

In this example, Fritz begins as first speaker and his words are placed between inverted commas. Apollonius is the second speaker and his remarks appear between double inverted commas. After the descriptive passage ("Apollonius sieht keine Rettung . . ."), Apollonius starts the exchange anew and it is his exclamation that is now put between inverted commas. Fritz has become the second speaker and his words are, therefore, enclosed by double inverted commas.

Ludwig also made use of double inverted commas in his edition of

---

[26] Second Edition, 15.

[27] Further examples, Second Edition, 176-177, 198.

[28] Second Edition, 262.

Die Heiterethei und ihr Widerspiel.[29] Here he employed them throughout in the same way as in the First, Second, and Third Editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.*[30] All posthumous editions of Ludwig's works, with the sole exception of the Freytag Edition, omit the double inverted commas.

The Third Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is basically the same as the Second Edition except that Ludwig inserted one additional section division [31] and occasionally returned, in matters of language, to formulations of the First Edition. The following examples show the text as it appears in the Second Edition in the left column and as it appears in the Third and First Editions in the right column. Italics have been added.

Er kam sich vor, als hätte er seinen Aufenthalt in der Fremde nur geträumt und *nun, da er erwacht, könne er sich* auf den Traum kaum mehr besinnen, . . .[32]	Er kam sich vor, als hätte er seinen Aufenthalt in der Fremde nur geträumt und *könne sich, nun er erwacht*, auf den Traum kaum mehr besinnen, . . .[33]
Aber es geschah nicht, wennschon Herr Nettenmair sich des Familienwesens seines Bruders und *dessen Kinder* väterlich annahm, . . .[34]	Aber es geschah nicht, wennschon Herr Nettenmair sich des Familienwesens seines Bruders und *der Kinder desselben* väterlich annahm, . . .[35]

---

[29] *Die Heiterethei* was written in 1854, but was not published in book form until 1857, i.e., *after* the First Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde.*

[30] *Die Heiterethei* begins as follows:

"Auch zum Gründer Markt, Dorle?"

" "Noch e' Bissle weiter; bis zum Zeinhammer. Und sagt, Frau Dotin, ob ihr was hinzubestellen habt. Vielleicht wieder was an den Herrn Factor? Und dann gebt's schnell. Dort wird man auch immer länger aufgehalten, als nöthig wär'. Und zu spät in die Nächt mag ich nicht." "

"Was das für ein Hastigthun ist!" sagte die Wirtin, vor deren Thür dieses Gespräch Statt fand. (*Die Heiterethei und ihr Widerspiel*, Zwei Erzählungen von Otto Ludwig. In: *Thüringer Naturen. Charakter- und Sittenbilder in Erzählungen von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld*, I, Frankfurt a. M., 1857. This series progressed no further than the first volume).

[31] Cf. Table of Section Divisions, and compare the Second Edition, 321 with the Third Edition, 302-303.

[32] Second Edition, 11.

[33] Third Edition, 10. First Edition, 10-11. The First Edition has "hätt' " instead of "hätte".

[34] Second Edition, 7.

[35] Third and First Editions, 7. For further examples of these minor changes in

II

The most important posthumous editions of Ludwig's works will now be examined, but a strict chronological sequence will not be retained here.[36] The editions will rather be discussed in order of their importance.

The first edition which must be considered is *Otto Ludwig's gesammelte Werke mit einer Einleitung von Gustav Freytag,* 1870. *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is contained in the fourth volume. The text of the novel here agrees with that of the Third Edition in its chapter divisions and appears at first sight a faithful reprint of Ludwig's text with correction of obvious misprints. However, the text of the Freytag edition contains throughout minor changes of Ludwig's wording, indeed, alterations of parts of the text which were not recast in any one of Ludwig's own three editions. The following examples, all taken from one page, page sixteen, of the Freytag edition, will serve to illustrate this. The Freytag text is given in the left column and Ludwig's text in the right. Italics have been added.

Meinte er, der arme Junge *hege* trotzige Gedanken . . .?	Meinte er, der arme Junge *denke* trotzige Gedanken . . .? [37]
An derselben Stelle, *wo* er jetzt auf die unter ihm liegende Stadt herabsah, hatte der Bruder Abschied von ihm genommen, und er ihm lange, lange nachgesehen. "Vielleicht gewinn' ich *sie dir* doch," hatte der Bruder gesagt, . . .	An derselben Stelle, *von der* er jetzt auf die unter ihm liegende Stadt herabsah, hatte der Bruder Abschied von ihm genommen, und er ihm lange, lange nachgesehen. "Vielleicht gewinn' ich *dir sie* doch", hatte der Bruder gesagt, . . .[38]

The next most important posthumous edition of Ludwig's works appeared from 1912 to 1922. This is the Paul Merker edition in six

---

the text, cf. First and Second Editions, 19, Third Edition, 18; First and Second Editions, 17, Third Edition, 16, etc.

[36] For this see the bibliography.

[37] First and Second Editions, 23. Third Edition, 22.

[38] First and Second Editions, 24. Third Edition, 23. For further examples, see especially Freytag, 11-12, and First Edition, 16-17, Second Edition, 17, and Third Edition, 16.

volumes, *Otto Ludwig. Sämtliche Werke. Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is included in the third volume. The method of the Merker Edition, its comparison of the three original editions and its list of variants between them, is that of a historical-critical edition, although the Merker Edition makes no such explicit claim in its title. This edition has provided the unquestioned text for several of the most important studies of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, especially for studies of Ludwig's method of narration in the novel, his supposed use of "erlebte Rede" and the inner monologue, e.g. R. Brinkmann's *Wirklichkeit und Illusion* [39] and Fritz Martini's *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*.[40]

The Merker Edition explicitly claims that its text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is based on the text of the Second Edition. Only in matters of spelling and punctuation is it supposed to differ from the Second Edition. "Unserem Abdruck zugrunde gelegt ist *A* [Second Edition], von dem den Prinzipien der Ausgabe gemäss nur in Fragen der Orthographie und Interpunktion abgegangen wurde." [41] This statement is false and a comparison of the section divisions of the Second Edition with those of the Merker Edition will prove so. The Second Edition has twenty-one section divisions, the Merker Edition twenty-four. The section divisions of the Merker Edition are actually the same as those of the First Edition plus the section division which Ludwig introduced into the Third Edition. The section divisions of the Merker Edition represent, therefore, all the divisions Ludwig made in his three editions, but which he made in *no single* edition. Moreover, Merker makes no mention in his notes, or anywhere else, that the text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* has been changed in this way. Such a presentation of a text is neither historical, nor critical.

---

[39] P. 146, footnote 1.

[40] P. 883, notes 351-354. Cf. also Albert Meyer, *Die Ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs* (Winterthur, 1957), 188, where Meyer refers to the Merker Edition as "Otto Ludwig, Werke, hist. krit. Ausgabe, hg. v. P. Merker". Waltraut Leuschner-Meschke also refers to the Merker Edition as a historical-critical one: *Werke Otto Ludwigs. Agnes-Bernauer-Dichtungen*, ed. W. Leuschner-Meschke (Berlin, 1961), I, vi. Indeed, the Merker edition is the one constantly quoted by Ludwig's critics.

[41] Merker, III, 307.

It must also be mentioned here that Merker twice claims the text of the Third Edition is exactly the same as that of the Second Edition. "B [Third Edition] ist in allen Punkten mit *A* [Second Edition] übereinstimmend." [42] "Dieser zweiten verbesserten Auflage des Jahres 1858 folgte 1862 noch eine dritte, die indessen lediglich einen Neudruck darstellte." [43] Once again Merker ignores Ludwig's division into sections. He does not point out the new section division which Ludwig introduced into the text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in the Third Edition, although he includes it in his own text! [44] More seriously, Merker has not perceived the textual differences between the Second and Third Editions, the reintroduction into the Third Edition of formulations of the First Edition which had been changed in the Second Edition.

Not only as regards the section division is the text of the Merker Edition a mixture of the variations which *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* underwent in Ludwig's three editions. The placing of "nur" in the following examples is an illustration of this.

First Edition:

> . . . der Alte sah in der Weigerung des Sohnes und dessen Beweis, er *nur* könne der schwierigen Lage des Hauses gerecht werden, den alten Trotz auf seine Unentbehrlichkeit, . . .[45]

Second and Third Editions:

> . . . der Alte sah in der Weigerung des Sohnes und dessen Beweis, er könne der schwierigen Lage des Hauses gerecht werden, *nur* den alten Trotz auf seine Unentbehrlichkeit, . . .[46]

In the Merker Edition, however, the "nur" occurs in both positions:

> . . . der Alte sah in der Weigerung des Sohnes und dessen Beweis, er *nur* könne der schwierigen Lage des Hauses gerecht werden, *nur* den alten Trotz auf seine Unentbehrlichkeit, . . .[47]

---

[42] Merker, III, 308.

[43] Merker, III, xiii.

[44] Merker, III, 202. In chapter I of this study, it was shown how Merker's failure to present a correct division into sections changed the emphasis from one feature to another in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*.

[45] P. 313. Italics mine.

[46] Second Edition, 317. Third Edition, 299. Italics mine.

[47] Merker, III, 200. Italics mine.

This is one of the occasions on which Merker does indicate in the notes that he has changed the text.[48] Why he makes his edition a potpourri of Ludwig's three editions, however, Merker does not explain.

There can be no serious quarrel with Merker's alteration of Ludwig's spelling, but there most certainly must be with his "modernization" of Ludwig's "difficult" punctuation. Merker writes of his own edition: "Die Interpunktion sucht die schweren Satzzeichen Ludwigs nach Möglichkeit beizuhalten, folgt aber im übrigen ebenfalls modernen Grundsätzen." [49] Merker omits all of Ludwig's double inverted commas, but inserts the normal form of the inverted commas ("") or a single inverted comma (') where Ludwig has none. The following are examples of this. The passage is quoted in the first column as it appears in the Second Edition and in the second column as it appears in the Merker Edition.

(A) Und er zählt immer noch Eins, Zwei; er sagt: nun muss – da hört er das Geräusch eines zerreissenden Tau's und fährt auf aus seinem wachen Fiebertraum.[50]	Und er zählt immer noch: "Eins, Zwei"; er sagt: "Nun muss –" da hört er das Geräusch eines zerreissenden Taus und fährt auf aus seinem wachen Fiebertraum.[51]
(B) Besonders hatte ihn die ewige Frage: Wie geht's Herr Nettenmair? dort vertrieben.[52]	Besonders hatte ihn die ewige Frage: "Wie geht's, Herr Nettenmair?" dort vertrieben.[53]
(C) Apollonius dachte: wenn es in den Thurm schlüge von Sankt Georg, dort in die Lücke und ich müsste hinauf und es schlüge Zwei und –. Er konnte nicht ausdenken.[54]	Apollonius dachte: "Wenn es in den Turm schlüge von Sankt Georg, dort in die Lücke, und ich müsste hinauf, und es schlüge zwei und –" Er konnte nicht ausdenken.[55]

The Merker Edition is, however, not even consistent in its alteration of Ludwig's punctuation, sometimes inserting a single inverted comma at the beginning and end of passages which in no way differ from passages such as the above where it inserts the normal form of inverted commas (").

---

[48] Merker, III, 320. Note to p. 200, lines 9 and 10.

[49] Merker, I, xv.

[50] Second Edition, 187.

[51] Merker, III, 119.

[52] Second Edition, 199.

[53] Merker, III, 126.

[54] Second Edition, 293.

[55] Merker, III, 185.

(D) Eine halb unwillkürliche Armbewegung schien zu sagen: mag er sie nehmen; sie ist für ihn gepflückt.[56]	Eine halb unwillkürliche Armbewegung schien zu sagen: 'Mag er sie nehmen; sie ist für ihn gepflückt!' [57]
(E) Und unter den leisen, mechanisch fortgesetzten Zurufen seines Mundes an den Bruder, der sie nicht mehr hörte, er solle schweigen, fragte er sich innerlich: bist du's auch, für den sie die Blume hierhergelegt? Hat sie die Blume für Jemand hierhergelegt? Sein Herz antwortete glücklich auf Beides ein Ja, . . [58].	Und unter den leisen, mechanisch fortgesetzten Zurufen seines Mundes an den Bruder, der sie nicht mehr hörte, er solle schweigen, fragte er sich innerlich: 'Bist du's auch, für den sie die Blume hierhergelegt? Hat sie die Blume für jemand hierhergelegt?' Sein Herz antwortete glücklich auf beides ein Ja, . . .[59]
(F) Zweimal sah er verstohlen in den Saal, wenn die Thür sich öffnete; er sah sie mit seinem Bruder tanzen, dann im Ausruhen vom Tanze den Bruder in seiner hastigen Weise auf sie hineinreden. Jetzt spricht er von mir, dachte er, über das ganze Gesicht erglühend.[60]	Zweimal sah er verstohlen in den Saal, wenn die Tür sich öffnete; er sah sie mit seinem Bruder tanzen, dann im Ausruhen vom Tanze den Bruder in seiner hastigen Weise auf sie hineinreden. 'Jetzt spricht er von mir', dachte er, über das ganze Gesicht erglühend.[61]

The Merker Edition is further inconsistent in its alteration of Ludwig's punctuation in that it ignores passages where, according to its principles, we would expect some form of inverted commas to be inserted.

(G) Sie hatte gemeint, Apollonius wolle sie beleidigen, und nun sagt das Kind: du hast ihn beleidigt.[62]

[56] Second Edition, 18.
[57] Merker, III, 14.
[58] Second Edition, 19.
[59] Merker, III, 14.
[60] Second Edition, 19.
[61] Merker, III, 14.
[62] Second Edition, 91.

The Merker Edition reprints this passage exactly, without inverted commas around *du hast ihn beleidigt*, as would be expected.[63]

> (H) O es war eine Welt von Glück, von Lachen und Weinen vor Glück, die aus den Thränen stieg, jede färbte sie regenbogenglänzender, jede rief: sie war dein, und die letzte jammerte: und sie ist dir gestohlen![64]

The Merker Edition does not insert inverted commas around *sie war dein* and *sie ist dir gestohlen*.[65]

Inverted commas or other similar punctuation signs have the force of separating most decisively a character's remarks from those of the other characters and the narrator. Ludwig separates the characters' remarks quite clearly from each other by his use of double inverted commas and paragraph divisions, but his omission of the inverted commas in the above passages is symptomatic of his tendency to obscure the division between the (subjective) thoughts and words of the characters and the (objective) remarks of the narrator.[66]

There are several other passages in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* which have no inverted commas in the First, Second, and Third Editions, but which do have in the Merker Edition. The passages are once more quoted in the first column as they appear in the First, Second, and Third Editions and, in the second column, as they appear in the Merker Edition. Italics have been added for emphasis. Ludwig's own italics are indicated by spacing, as, indeed, is his practice in his three editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*.

---

[63] Merker, III, 59.

[64] Second Edition, 127.

[65] Merker, III, 81.

[66] Richard Brinkmann has noted a similar phenomenon in the grammatical structure of Ludwig's sentences. "Die Form rein logischer Unterordnung eines Satzes ('er war bei sich einig, der Bruder hatte . . .'), bei der alle äusseren grammatischen Kennzeichen der Unterordnung aufgegeben sind (wie Konjunktion oder Konjunktiv oder Doppelpunkt), gibt es freilich vor Ludwig. Aber es ist kein Zweifel, dass sie bei Ludwig eine ganz bestimmte und neue Funktion bekommt, nämlich als Mittel der Vereinigung und Vermischung von subjektivem und objektivem Wert der Aussage. Es gibt überdies, soweit wir sehen, vor Ludwig kein Prosawerk, in dem diese Konstruktion in solchem Übermass verwendet wird, und das ist bezeichnend" (*Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, 198, footnote 1).

(J) Er [Fritz] hatte die Eifersucht als letztes Mittel angewandt. Das war wieder eine Thorheit, und er bereute sie schon. *Sie kann sich nicht verstellen; und wäre er* [Apollonius] *noch ganz der alte Träumer, ihre Aufregung muss ihm verrathen. was in ihr vorgeht; ihre Aufregung muss ihr selber verrathen. was in ihr vorgeht. Noch weiss sie es selbst ja nicht. Und dann* – er stand wieder an dem Punkte, zu dem jeder Ausgang ihn führt; er sah sie sich verstehen; "und dann", zwängte er zwischen den Zähnen hervor, dass jede Silbe daran sich blutig riss, "und dann – wird sie's schon lernen!" [67]	Er [Fritz] hatte die Eifersucht als letztes Mittel angewandt. Das war wieder eine Torheit, und er bereute sie schon. "Sie kann sich nicht verstellen, und wäre er noch ganz der alte Träumer, ihre Aufregung muss ihm verraten, was in ihr vorgeht. Noch weiss sie es selbst ja nicht. Und dann" – er stand wieder an dem Punkte, zu dem jeder Ausgang ihn führt: er sah sie sich verstehen – "und dann", zwängte er zwischen den Zähnen hervor dass jede Silbe daran sich blutig riss, "und dann – wird sie's schon lernen!" [68]
(K) Sie lag, die heissen Hände gefalten, lange, lang. Da stieg es empor aus dem leisen Weben, silbern wie ein Ostermorgenglockenklang. *Was fürchtest du dich vor ihm?* Und sie sah all' ihre Engel um sich knieen, und er war einer von ihren Engeln. Der schönste und der stärkste und der mildeste.[69]	Sie lag, die heissen Hände gefalten, lange, lang. Da stieg es empor aus dem leisen Weben, silbern wie ein Ostermorgenglockenklang: "Was fürchtest du dich vor ihm?" Und sie sah all ihre Engel um sich knieen, und er war einer von ihren Engeln, der schönste und der stärkste und der mildeste.[70]
(L) Fritz Nettenmair ahnte aus den Vorbereitungen, was kommen müsse. Er rang nach Trotz. *Wenn er's* [Herr Nettenmair] *in*	Fritz Nettenmair ahnte aus den Vorbereitungen, was kommen müsse. Er rang nach Trotz. "Wenn er's in seinem Argwohn errät, wer

---

[67] First Edition, 92. Second Edition, 92. Third Edition, 88. Freytag Edition, 61.

[68] Merker, III, 60. There is an uncorrected misprint in the above passage as it appears in the Merker Edition. The following words have been omitted: "ihre Aufregung muss ihr selber verrathen, was in ihr vorgeht."

[69] First Edition, 126-127. Second Edition, 129. Third Edition, 122. Freytag Edition, 85. The Second, Third, and Freytag Editions change the punctuation of the last two sentences of the above passage to the following (as the Merker Edition records): "Und sie sah all' ihre Engel um sich knieen, und er war einer von ihren Engeln, der schönste und der stärkste und der mildeste."

[70] Merker, III, 82-83.

seinem Argwohn erräth, wer will mir's beweisen? Und könnt' er's beweisen, er giebt mich nicht an; davor bin ich sicher. Warum auch sonst will er leise reden? mag er sagen, was er will, ich weiss nichts, ich bin's nicht gewesen, ich hab' nichts gethan. Sein Gesicht rang. . .[71]

(M) Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz. Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm Alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wenn Er gehen müsste, Er! Die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen. *Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt, als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein, wie Alles, was einmal mein war! Sie ist in ihren Kleidern zu Bett gegangen; sie kann die Stunde nicht erwarten, wo ich gehe; und ginge Er, diese Rosen würden bleich, sie flösse sterbend in ihn hinüber, um nicht getrennt von ihm zu sein. Wie sie auffahren würde, sagte ihr einer in den Traum hinein, den sie von ihm träumt, denn sie lächelt,*

will mir's beweisen? Und könnt' er's beweisen, er gibt mich nicht an; davor bin ich sicher. Warum auch sonst will er leise reden? Mag er sagen, was er will, ich weiss nichts, ich bin's nicht gewesen, ich hab' nichts getan." Sein Gesicht rang . . .[72]

Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz. Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wenn er gehen müsste, er! die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen. Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, sein Weib, seins! "Auch sein wie alles, was einmal mein war! Sie ist in ihren Kleidern zu Bett gegangen; sie kann die Stunde nicht erwarten, wo ich gehe; und ginge er, diese Rosen würden bleich, sie flösse sterbend in ihn hinüber, um nicht getrennt von ihm zu sein. Wie sie auffahren würde, sagte ihr einer in den Traum hinein, den sie von ihm träumt, denn sie lächelt: 'Er

---

[71] First Edition, 211-212. Second Edition, 216. Third Edition, 203-204. Freytag Edition, 142.

[72] Merker, III, 136-137.

er geht! Er, ihr – Nein! ich will nicht gehen! Nein! ich kann nicht gehen! Lieber tausendmal sterben! Und er hat . . .[73]	geht!' Er, ihr – Nein! ich will nicht gehen! Nein! ich kann nicht gehen! Lieber tausendmal sterben!" Und er hat . . .[74]

Why insert inverted commas and make other changes[75] in the punctuation of passages which appear in three of the author's own editions "uncorrected" in this way, especially when Ludwig himself and his friend Berthold Auerbach revised the text,[76] inserted inverted commas and otherwise changed the punctuation where this was found necessary? Can we believe that Ludwig failed to insert the inverted commas where the Merker Edition does in the (J) passage when he placed inverted commas around Fritz's spoken words in the same passage? Can we believe that, although Ludwig changed, from one edition to another, the punctuation of the (K) passage in the last two sentences, he neglected to place inverted commas where the Merker Edition does? The (M) passage[77] reveals most clearly the danger of Merker's tampering with Ludwig's punctuation. The passage begins with author description in the first sentence:

Fritz Nettenmair lacht im wilden Hohn und schluchzt zugleich im hülflosen Schmerz.

---

[73] First Edition, 249. Second Edition, 253-254. Third Edition, 239-240. Freytag Edition, 167.

[74] Merker, III, 160.

[75] *(A) Passage*: Merker inserts one colon, removes one capital, adds one capital; *(B) Passage*: inserts one comma; *(C) Passage*: inserts two commas and one capital; *(D) Passage*: inserts one exclamation mark and one capital; *(E) Passage*: removes one capital and inserts one; *(J) Passage*: changes one semicolon to a colon, another semicolon to a dash and omits a comma; *(M) Passage*: removes seven capitals and inserts two, etc.

[76] The authority for this is Merker himself. "Unterdessen aber hatte sich auch das Bedürfnis einer zweiten Auflage der deutschen Ausgabe [of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*] herausgestellt, da der Roman viel gelesen wurde und auch in Österreich sein Publikum fand (Ludwig an Ambrunn, Januar 1858). Nachdem der Verleger Meidinger im Februar 1857 dem Dichter davon Mitteilung gemacht hatte, sandte Ludwig ein zu diesem Zwecke durchschossenes Exemplar der ersten Auflage an Auerbach, um diesem Gelegenheit zu Verbesserungsvorschlägen zu geben (vgl. Ludwig an Auerbach, 16. Februar 1857)" (III, xiii). Ludwig's letter of February, 1857, is reprinted in *Otto-Ludwig-Kalender*, ed. Wilhelm Greiner (Weimar, 1931), 21.

[77] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, Third Edition, 239-240.

There is then "erlebte Rede": [78]

Die Kinder sind ja nicht mehr sein. Er ist ja ihr Vater nicht mehr. Er [Apollonius] ist's. Er! Seine Kinder sind's. Er ist ihr Vater. Er, der ihm Alles genommen, hat ihm auch die Kinder genommen. Das, was man dem Elendesten lässt. Wenn Er gehen müsste, Er! Die Kinder hingen sich an ihn; eher rissen die Händchen, als dass sie ihn liessen.

Somewhere in the next sentence, the narrative goes over into the first person of Fritz. The use of "mein" tells us this.

Und das Weib hier, dies schöne Weib mit dem Engelsantlitz, auf das selbst die Lampe liebend all ihre Strahlen sammelt und mehr Glanz von ihr gewinnt, als sie von der Lampe; dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein, wie Alles, was einmal mein war!

Just where the change to the first person takes place in this sentence is difficult to determine with complete certainty. Merker breaks the sentence in two by changing "auch" to "Auch" and inserting inverted commas. However, the first person narrative from Fritz's point of view could, and most probably does, commence at the beginning of the above sentence or, at the latest, at "dieses Weib, Sein Weib, Seins! auch Sein . . ." and ends several sentences later at "Lieber tausendmal sterben!"

In the final chapter of the present analysis of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* it is considered whether Ludwig was careless in the (J), (K), (L), and (M) passages or whether these passages in their original form have a function in the novel. Are they to be regarded (especially the italicized section of the (M) passage) in their *intention* or by their *effect* as early examples of the inner monologue? Amongst others, Fritz Martini claims that Ludwig employed the technique of the inner monologue, without, however, referring to any examples.[79]

In 1896 Viktor Schweizer published a three-volume edition of Ludwig's works, *Ludwigs Werke. Kritisch durchgesehene und erläuterte Ausgabe.*[80] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is contained in the third volume. The text is, according to Schweizer,[81] based on that of the Third Edition, 1862. The Schweizer text of the novel is, however, not that of the Third Edition. Schweizer reintroduces the section division of the First Edition at "Es hat Alles . . ." into his text.[82] Ludwig omitted this section division in the Second and Third Editions.[83] Like Merker, Schweizer makes no mention of his change in Ludwig's section divisions, nor of the reason for it. He also, on occasion, alters Ludwig's punctuation, as in his version of the (D), (E), and (F) passages,[84] but elsewhere keeps to the original, as in the very important (M) passage.[85]

---

[78] The term is defined in chap. VIII of the present study.

[79] *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus*, 468. Also McClain (p. 59) and Witte (p. 50) state that Ludwig used the inner monologue. Their arguments and examples are examined in chap. VIII of the present study.

[80] Leipzig and Vienna, 1898.

The Adolf Stern edition, *Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften*, 1891, is totally unreliable as far as the text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is concerned. Stern solves the problem of Ludwig's punctuation by omitting all inverted commas. He also even attempts to "improve" Ludwig's style. Merker and Schweizer have called attention to this, so there is no need to pursue the matter further.[86]

The text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in Part Two of Arthur Eloesser's *Ludwigs Werke in vier Teilen* is also unreliable.[87] Eloesser seems to follow the text of the Second Edition, but he makes a section division at "Es hat Alles . . .", where the Second Edition has none.[88] Occasionally, Eloesser omits inverted commas, as Stern does, and occasionally inserts them, as Merker does. An example of the former is the (J) passage as it appears in the Eloesser Edition.

Und dann – er stand wieder an dem Punkte, zu dem jeder Ausgang ihn führt; er sah sie sich verstehen; und dann, zwängte er zwischen den

---

[81] Schweizer, III, 374.

[82] Cf. Table of Section Divisions, and compare Schweizer Edition, 185, with the First Edition, 259.

[83] Cf. Table of Section Divisions, and compare First Edition, 259, with Second Edition, 263-264, and Third Edition, 248.

[84] Schweizer, III, 20-21.

[85] III, 178. Despite these facts, however, the Schweizer text of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* is far more reliable than that of Merker, and W. H. McClain's censure of the Schweizer Edition (*Between Real and Ideal*, 98) would be better applied to the Merker Edition which he, like Brinkmann and Martini, considers the authoritative text.

[86] Merker, I, xiii. Schweizer, III, 374.

[87] Berlin, 1908.

[88] Cf. Table of Section Divisions.

Zähnen hervor, dass jede Silbe daran sich blutig riss, und dann – wird sie's schon lernen! [89]

An example of Eloesser's unexplained insertion of inverted commas is to be found in his treatment of the (L) passage which he changes in exactly the same way as Merker does.[90]

Of the countless single editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, only two can be mentioned here: one of them because of its utter disregard for the original text and the other because of its widespread use. The edition of the "Atlas Verlag", Cologne, makes on the back of its title page the self-conscious claim to being unabridged.[91] That this claim is false can be readily seen by an examination of the first page of the text of this edition. All but the first sentence of the first paragraph of the novel is omitted here. The Atlas Edition has also considerable mistakes in its section division and in its punctuation.[92] It is the only edition which fails to make a division at "Und Fritz Nettenmair? . . ." [93] This evidence suggests that the unnamed editor of the Atlas Edition has been very careless indeed.

The Reclam Edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* [94] proves to be, in the main, a copy of the Merker Edition, except that it does not make the section division at "Fritz Nettenmair schlief . . ." which the Merker Edition does.[95] The Reclam Edition even reprints uncorrected the Merker Edition misprint in the (J) passage.[96]

A special category in the editions of Ludwig's works is formed by those of Adolf Bartels, Friedrich Bernt, and Walter Eichner. Adolf Bartels' *Otto Ludwigs Werke in sechs Bänden* [97] contains in volume five a reprint of Ludwig's First Edition, except that all double inverted commas are omitted. Volume four of Friedrich Bernt's *Otto*

---

[89] Eloesser, II, 65.

[90] Eloesser, II, 131. Merkes III, 136-137.

[91] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Cologne) [n.d.].

[92] E.g., Atlas Verlag Edition, 9ff.

[93] Cf. Table of Section Divisions, and compare Atlas Verlag Edition, 145, with First Edition, 245, Second Edition, 250, and Third Edition, 236.

[94] *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Stuttgart, 1960), with an epilogue by Konrad Nussbächer.

[95] Cf. Table of Section Divisions, and compare Merker Edition, 108, with Reclam Edition, 136.

[96] Reclam, p. 75. Merker, III, 60. Cf. also note 68 of this appendix.

[97] Leipzig, 1900.

Ludwigs ausgewählte Werke in vier Bänden[98] presents also the text of the First Edition minus the double inverted commas. Walter Eichner's *Otto Ludwigs ausgewählte Werke in sieben Büchern*[99] could have been a valuable edition of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, for its sixth book presents the text of the Third Edition except for the double inverted commas. However, Eichner's text abounds in serious misprints which make it worthless. In the narrator's highly important comment on the misunderstanding between Apollonius and his father, for example, the key words, "das Zurückhalten", are omitted.[100]

From this examination of the most important editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*, it can be seen that only the Third Edition presents the text of the novel in the form the author himself finally gave it.

---

[98] Leipzig, 1907.

[99] Berlin, 1902.

[100] Eichner, VI, 179. Third Edition, 299.

TABLE OF SECTION DIVISIONS OF THE EDITIONS OF *ZWISCHEN HIMMEL UND ERDE*

Opening Words	First Edition Sec. P.	Second Edition Sec. P.	Third Edition Sec. P.	Freytag Edition Sec. P.	Merker Edition Sec. P.	Schweizer Edition Sec. P.	Eloesser Edition Sec. P.	Reclam Edition Sec. P.
Das Gärtchen liegt . . .	(1) 1	(1) 1	(1) 1	(1) 1	(1) 3	(1) 9	(1) 15	(1) 3
So blättern wir . . .	(2) 9	(2) 10	(2) 9	(2) 7	(2) 8	(2) 15	(2) 19	(2) 9
Wer in das Haus . . .	(3) 35	(3) 35[a]	(3) 34[a]	(3) 24[a]	(3) 24[a]	(3) 32[a]	(3) 33[a]	(3) 30[a]
Zwischen Himmel und Erde . . .	(4) 69	(4) 70	(4) 66	(4) 46	(4) 46	(4) 55	(4) 52	(4) 57
Nun waren schon . . .	(5) 87	(5) 88	(5) 83	(5) 58	(5) 57	(5) 67	(5) 62	(5) 71
Fritz Nettenmair dachte . . .	(6) 98	(6) 99	(6) 93	(6) 65	(6) 64	(6) 74	(6) 68	(6) 80
Ännchen hatte . . .	(7) 104	(7) 106	(7) 100	(7) 70	(7) 68	(7) 79	(7) 71	(7) 85
Es war eines Abends . . .	(8) 117	(8) 119	(8) 113	(8) 79	(8) 76	(8) 88	(8) 78	(8) 96
Das Leben in dem . . .	(9) 128	(9) 130	(9) 123	(9) 86	(9) 83	(9) 95	(9) 85	(9) 104
Dächer, die mit . . .	(10) 140	(10) 143	(10) 135	(10) 94	(10) 91	(10) 104	(10) 91	(10) 115
In Fritz Nettenmair . . .	(11) 153	(11) 156	(11) 147	(11) 103	(11) 99	(11) 113	(11) 98	(11) 125
Fritz Nettenmair schlief . . .	(12) 167				(12) 108			
Die Reparatur . . .	(13) 175	(12) 178	(12) 168	(12) 117	(13) 113	(12) 127	(12) 110	(12) 143
Von dieser Nacht an . . .	(14) 188	(13) 191	(13) 180	(13) 126	(14) 121	(13) 136	(13) 118	(13) 153
Zwischen Himmel und Erde . . .	(15) 208	(14) 212	(14) 200	(14) 140	(15) 134	(14) 150	(14) 129	(14) 170
Unterdess war . . .	(16) 223	(15) 227	(15) 214	(15) 150	(16) 144	(15) 160	(15) 137	(15) 182
Nichts von alledem . . .	(17) 240[b]	(16) 244[b]	(16) 230[b]	(16) 161[b]	(17) 154[b]	(16) 172[b]	(16) 146[b]	(16) 196[b]

	First Edition Sec. P.	Second Edition Sec. P.	Third Edition Sec. P.	Freytag Edition Sec. P.	Merker Edition Sec. P.	Schweizer Edition Sec. P.	Eloesser Edition Sec. P.	Reclam Edition Sec. P.
Und Fritz Nettenmair? . . .	(18) 245	(17) 250	(17) 236	(17) 165	(18) 158	(17) 175	(17) 149	(17) 200
Apollonius hatte . . .	(19) 251[c]	(18) 256[c]	(18) 241[c]	(18) 168[c]	(19) 161[c]	(18) 179[c]	(18) 152[c]	(18) 205[c]
Es hat Alles . . .	(20) 259				(20) 166	(19) 185	(19) 156	(19) 211
Apollonius hielt sich . . .	(21) 271	(19) 276	(19) 260	(19) 182	(21) 174	(20) 193	(20) 163	(20) 221
Es war in der Nacht . . .	(22) 285	(20) 289	(20) 272-273	(20) 190	(22) 182	(21) 201-202	(21) 170	(21) 232
Wir überspringen . . .	(23) 309	(21) 314	(21) 295-296	(21) 206	(23) 197	(22) 218	(22) 183	(22) 251
Apollonius genas rasch . . .			(22) 302-303	(22) 211	(24) 202	(23) 223		(23) 257

[a] The third section of all editions except the First Edition begins: "Wer heute in das Haus. . . ."

[b] The sixteenth section of the Second, Third, Freytag, Schweizer, Eloesser, and Reclam Editions and the seventeenth section of the Merker Edition begin: "Von Allem, was er heute gewollt und gelitten, . . ." Otherwise the beginning of these sections is the same as the seventeenth section of the First Edition.

[c] The eighteenth section of the Second, Third, Freytag, Schweizer, Eloesser, and Reclam Editions and the nineteenth section of the Merker Edition begin: "Apollonius war müde vom Wachen und vom Kampfe. . . ." Otherwise the beginning of these sections is the same as that of the nineteenth section of the First Edition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. EDITIONS OF OTTO LUDWIG'S WORKS

(A) Editions of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*:

Zwischen Himmel und Erde, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Frankfurt a. M., 1856) [First Edition].

Zwischen Himmel und Erde, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Frankfurt a. M., 1858) [Second Edition].

Zwischen Himmel und Erde, Erzählung von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld (Berlin, 1862) [Third Edition].

Otto Ludwig's gesammelte Werke, ed. Gustav Freytag (Berlin, 1870), IV.

Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften, ed. Adolf Stern (Leipzig, 1891), I.

Ludwigs Werke, ed. Viktor Schweizer (Leipzig and Vienna, 1898), III.

Otto Ludwigs Werke, ed. Adolf Bartels (Leipzig, 1900), V.

Otto Ludwigs Ausgewählte Werke, ed. Walter Eichner (Berlin, 1902), VI.

Otto Ludwigs Ausgewählte Werke, ed. Friedrich Bernt (Leipzig, 1907), IV.

Ludwigs Werke, ed. Arthur Eloesser (Berlin-Leipzig-Vienna-Stuttgart, 1908), II.

Otto Ludwig Sämtliche Werke, ed. Paul Merker (Munich and Leipzig, 1912-1922), III.

Zwischen Himmel und Erde, with a concluding essay by Konrad Nussbächer (Stuttgart, 1960).

Zwischen Himmel und Erde (Cologne, Atlas Verlag, n.d.).

(B) Editions of Otto Ludwig's Other Works:

Die Heiterethei und Ihr Widerspiel, in: *Thüringer Naturen. Charakter- und Sittenbilder in Erzählungen von Otto Ludwig aus Eisfeld* (Frankfurt a. M., 1857), I.

Studien in: *Otto Ludwigs gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Adolf Stern (Leipzig, 1891), V, VI.

Werke Otto Ludwigs. Agnes-Bernauer-Dichtungen, ed. Waltraut Leuschner-Meschke (Berlin, 1961), I.

2. EDITIONS OF LITERARY WORKS OTHER THAN THOSE OF OTTO LUDWIG

Auden, W. H., *Collected Shorter Poems, 1930-1944* (London, 1959).

Baudelaire, Charles, *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. Y. G. le Dantec (Tours, 1958).

Brentano, Clemens, *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Heinz Amelung and Karl Viëtor (Frankfurt a. M., 1923), I.

Büchner, Georg, *Werke und Briefe* (Wiesbaden, 1958).

Ehrenstein, Albert, *Gedichte und Prosa* (Berlin, 1961).

Flaubert, Gustave, *Madame Bovary* (Paris, 1958).

Goethe, J. W., *Goethes Werke*, ed. Erich Trunz (Hamburg, 1960), I.

Hoffmann, E. T. A., *Die Elixiere des Teufels*, ed. W. Müller-Seidel (Munich, 1961).

Joyce, James, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (New York, 1960).

——, *Ulysses* (London, 1960).

MacNeice, Louis, *Poems 1925-1940* (New York, 1940).

Mallarmé, Stéphane, *Vers et Prose*, ed. Henry Mondor (Paris, 1961).

Novalis, *Schriften*, ed. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel (Stuttgart, 1960).

Stevens, Wallace, *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens* (London, 1955).

Stifter, Adalbert, *Der Hochwald* in: *Studien*, ed. Max Stefl (Augsburg, 1955), I.

Ungaretti, Giuseppe, *Gedichte* (Suhrkamp Verlag, 1961).

Weinheber, Josef, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Josef Nadler and Hedwig Weinheber (Salzburg, 1953), I.

Wordsworth, William, "Tintern Abbey", in: *The Centuries' Poetry*, ed. Denys Kilham Roberts (Melbourne-London-Baltimore, 1954), III, 150-155.

3. CRITICAL WORKS

Atkins, Stuart Pratt, "A Note on Fritz Nettenmair", *Monatshefte*, XXXI (1939), 349-352.

Auerbach, Erich, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur* (Bern, 1959).

Badt, Kurt, *Wolkenbilder und Wolkengedichte der Romantik* (Berlin, 1960).

Becker, George J., *Documents of Modern Literary Realism* (Princeton, 1963).

Berkhout, A. P., "Biedermeier und Poetischer Realismus. Stilistische Beobachtungen über Werke von Grillparzer, Mörike, Stifter, Hebbel und Ludwig", diss. Amsterdam (1942).

Besch, Lutz, "Die künstlerische Gestaltung der Novelle *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *GRM*, XXXI (1943), 19-30.

Betz, Johanna, "Otto Ludwigs Verhältnis zu den Engländern", diss. Frankfurt a. M. (1929).

Böschenstein, Hermann, "Zum Aufbau von Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXIV (1942), 343-356.

Brinkmann, Richard, *Wirklichkeit und Illusion. Studien über Gehalt und Grenzen des Begriffs Realismus für die erzählende Dichtung des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1957).

Broch, Hermann, *Gesammelte Werke. Essays I*, ed. Hannah Arendt (Zürich, 1955).

Daiches, David, *The Novel and the Modern World* (Chicago, 1960).

de Jong, Jr., Gerrit, "Elements of Musicality in the Literary and Critical Works of Otto Ludwig", diss. Stanford (1933).

Dujardin, Edouard, *Le monologue intérieur* (Paris, 1931).

Edel, Leon, *The Psychological Novel 1900-1950* (London, 1955).

Ellmann, Richard, *James Joyce* (New York, 1959).

Emrich, Wilhelm, *Protest und Verheissung* (Frankfurt a. M. and Bonn, 1960).

Fey, Nikolaus, "Otto Ludwig als nationaler Führer", *OLK*, 1931, 7ff.

Fischer, Bernhard, "Volksgestalten und Volkstümliches bei Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1931, 70ff.

Forest, Lotte W., "Das Leitmotiv in Otto Ludwigs Erzählungen *Die Heiteretei* und *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", Master of Arts Thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore (1951).

Friedrich, Hugo, *Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik* (Hamburg, 1960).

—, *Drei Klassiker des französischen Romans* (Frankfurt a. M., 1961).

Gilbert, Stuart, *Das Rätsel Ulysses,* trans. by Georg Goyert (Zürich, 1960).

Göpfert, Herbert, "Otto Ludwig Bibliographie", *OLK*, 1931, 92-107.

Greiner, Wilhelm, "Die Poesie des Thüringer Waldes bei Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1929, 40ff.

—, *Otto Ludwig als Thüringer in seinem Leben und seinen Werken* (Halle a. d. S., 1913).

—, Otto Ludwigs Wahrheitsfanatismus als Geisteserbe aus Stamm und Sippe", *OLK*, 1942, 45ff.

—, "Thüringische Einflüsse bei Goethe und Otto Ludwig", *OLK*, 1932, 33ff.

Griessmann, Helmut, "Die Raumgestaltung in Friedrich von Hardenbergs *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* und Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", diss. Bonn (1955).

Heuer, Renate, Review of Richard Brinkmann's *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*, in *Euphorion*, LIII (1959), 467-474.

Hohlfeld, Alexander R., "The Life of Otto Ludwig", in: *The German Classics of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Kuno Francke (New York, 1914), IX, 268-279.

Holl, Karl, "Otto Ludwig Probleme, I", *GRM*, VI (1914), 16-31.

—, "Otto Ludwig Probleme, II", *GRM*, VI (1914), 87-100.

Höllerer, Walter, *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne. Lachen und Weinen in der Dichtung einer Übergangszeit* (Stuttgart, 1958).

Humphrey, Robert, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959).

Jahn, Günter, "Übermensch, Mensch und Zeit in den Dramen Christian Dietrich Grabbes", diss. Göttingen (1950).

James, Henry, *The Art of the Novel*, ed. Leon Edel (New York, 1950).

Kaiser, Gerhard, "Um eine Neubegründung des Realismusbegriffs", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie,* LXXVII (1958), 161-176.

Kelly, H. A., "Consciousness in the Monologues of Ulysses", *MLQ*, XXIV (1963), 3-12.

Kerrinnis, Ursula, "Morphologische Untersuchungen an Otto Ludwigs Erzählung *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", diss. Bonn (1949).

Klein, Johannes, *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle von Goethe bis zur Gegenwart* (Wiesbaden, 1960).

Kley, Karl, "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* und die Heimaterlebnisse Otto Ludwigs", *OLK*, 1940, 59-68.

Kluckhohn, Paul, *Das Ideengut der deutschen Romantik* (Tübingen, 1961).

Koch, Franz, "Zur Kunst der Interpretation. Anlässlich von Richard Brinkmanns *Wirklichkeit und Illusion*", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LXXVII (1958), 407-422.

Kolisko, Gertrude, "Syntactic Anomalies and Pronominal Ambiguity in Otto Ludwig's Narrative Prose", *MLR*, LX (1965), 65-72.

Kracke, Arthur, "Otto Ludwigs Bluterbe", *OLK*, 1935, 104ff.

——, "*Zwischen Himmel und Erde* als Otto Ludwigs ureigenstes Werk", *OLK*, 1942, 15-33.

Kunz, Josef, Discussion of *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* in: *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, ed. W. Stammler (Berlin, 1960), II, 1872-73.

Leuschner-Meschke, Waltraut, "Aus Otto Ludwigs Kunstauffassung", in: *Worte und Werte. Bruno Markwardt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1961), 200-213.

Lockemann, Fritz, *Gestalt und Wandlungen der deutschen Novelle. Geschichte einer literarischen Gattung im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1957).

Loesing, H. E., "Der Aufbau der Novellen Otto Ludwigs und ihr Verhältnis zu seinen Romanstudien", diss. Bonn (1953).

Loevenich, Heinrich, "Zur Bedeutung des Raumes in Erzählungen", *Der Deutschunterricht*, XV (1963), 98-102.

Lohre, Heinrich, "Otto Ludwigs Romanstudien und seine Erzählungspraxis", in *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht der zehnten Realschule zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1913).

——, "Otto Ludwig und Charles Dickens", *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXXIV (1910), 15-45.

Lorck, Etienne, *Die erlebte Rede* (Heidelberg, 1921).

Lüder, Fritz, *Die epischen Werke Otto Ludwigs und ihr Verhältnis zu Charles Dickens* (Leipzig, 1910).

McClain, William H., *Between Real and Ideal. The Course of Otto Ludwig's Development as a Narrative Writer* (= *University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures*, No. 40) (Chapel Hill, 1963).

Martini, Fritz, *Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus, 1848-1898.* (Stuttgart, 1962).

——, *Forschungsbericht zur deutschen Literatur in der Zeit des Realismus* (Stuttgart, 1962).

Mennemeier, F. N., *Das moderne Drama des Auslandes* (Düsseldorf, 1961).

Meyer, Albert, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Otto Ludwigs* (Winterthur, 1957).

Müller-Ems, Richard, *Otto Ludwigs Erzählungskunst, mit Berücksichtigung der historischen Verhältnisse nach den Erzählungen und theoretischen Schriften des Dichters* (Berlin, 1905).

Nussbächer, Konrad, Epilogue in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* (Stuttgart, 1960), 260-264.

Price, Lawrence M., *Die Aufnahme englischer Literatur in Deutschland 1500-1960* (Bern, 1961).

Price, Lawrence M., "Otto Ludwig's *Zwischen Himmel und Erde* and George Eliot's *Adam Bede*", in *Dichtung und Deutung. Gedächtnisschrift für Hans M. Wolf*, ed. Karl S. Guthke (Bern and Munich, 1961), 113-116.

Raphaël, Gaston, *Otto Ludwig, ses théories et ses œuvres romanesques* (Paris, 1920).

Rehm, Walter, "Der Dichter und die neue Einsamkeit", *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde*, XLV (1931), 545-565.

Reuschel, Karl, "Über Anfang und Schluss von Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Euphorion*, XXIV (1922), 880-884.

Reuter, H.-H., "Otto Ludwig als Erzähler. Seine epischen Möglichkeiten", diss. Jena (1957).

Rose, Ernst, *A History of German Literature* (New York, 1960).

Schäfer, Werner, "Der Traum bei Dichtern des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, Franz Grillparzer, Friedrich Hebbel, Otto Ludwig, Gottfried Keller", diss. Tübingen (1952).

Schöne, Albrecht, Interpretation of "Erinnerung an die Marie A.", in: *Die deutsche Lyrik. Form und Geschichte*, ed. Benno von Wiese (Düsseldorf, 1957), II, 484-494.

Semrau, Horsthardi, "Das poetische Warnbild bei Otto Ludwig", diss. Mainz (1963).

Silz, Walter, "Nature in the Tales of Otto Ludwig", *MLN*, XLI (1926), 8-13.

Sokel, Walter, *The Writer in Extremis* (Stanford, 1959).

Tiemann, Fritz, "Der Einklang von Natur und Mensch in der äusseren Gestalt der Werke Otto Ludwigs", *OLK*, 1933, 54-63.

Walzel, Oskar, *Das Wortkunstwerk* (Leipzig, 1926).

——, *Die deutsche Literatur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1929).

——, *Gehalt und Gestalt im Kunstwerk des Dichters*, as: *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, III (Berlin, 1923).

Washington, Ida Harrison, "The Theme of Courtship and Marriage in the Prose Works of Three Poetic Realists: Ludwig, Gotthelf, Keller", diss. Columbia (1962).

Weigand, Hermann J., "Zu Otto Ludwigs *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*", *Monatshefte*, XXXVIII (1946), 385-402.

Wellek, René and Warren, Austin, *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1956).

von Wiese, Benno, *Zwischen Utopie und Wirklichkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1963).

Witte, Elisabeth, "Otto Ludwigs Erzählkunst", diss. Göttingen (1958).

PT2426
.Z4L5

4625

ST. OLAF COLLEGE
PT2426.Z4 L5
Lillyman, Willi - Otto Ludwig's Zwischen Himmel un
3 0111 00303 4559

T2-DVP-624